SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_59159**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Solubility of Calcium Phosphate Crystallization in vitro in presence of Basella rubra Deproteinized Concoction used in non-codified medicine for Urinary stones**
Type of the Article	**Short Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Article needs to be rewritten with good English. There are many punctuation errors and syntax errors that should be corrected. 2. Introduction a. Missing references b. References for figure c. Missing the year in the text references. 3. Materials and Methods a. Missing references that the authors followed b. In step "2.2 Collection of the plant material", keeping the parts of the plant in 4°C is freezing and not refrigerated as mentioned by the authors. c. In step "2.3 Preparation of deproteinized concoction", aqueous extraction again and again ???. Authors should mention how many times the extraction was performed and the volume of solvent used. d. In step "2.3 Preparation of deproteinized concoction", authors did not mention the volume used of saturated ammonium sulphate. e. In general, the method should be rewritten more clearly. f. It is better not the write a reference in the title as in "**2.4 Preliminary Phytochemical Screening** (Boxi *et al*)." g. In Fehling test, authors should mention either bring to boil or boil for ???? time. h. In Molisch test, authors should mention the volume of the concoction added to the reagent. i. In general, authors should take care of the missing information in the methods steps. **j.** The title in "**3.2.1 Solubility effect on calcium phosphate**" is not clear. **k.** DMSO solvent should be written in detail when mentioned for the first time with the abbreviation, then authors can use the abbreviation only. **l.** In step "3.2.1 Solubility effect on calcium phosphate", the different concentrations (50 mg/ml and 100 mg/ml concentrations of each), is it for DMSO or the concoction?? **m.** In step "3.2.1 Solubility effect on calcium phosphate", what is the meaning of Calculax?? **n.** In statistical analysis, authors applying ANOVA using two samples per each. Please make it clear? 4. In "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION", it covers only results, authors should discuss their results according to the active constituents found. 5. Conclusion should cover what the authors found and not part of the discussion.	Noted and corrected. No. Given. No. No. Yes, changed. It was refrigerated. Changed. Thrice. **Drug : solvent ratio** (1:4). Saturated ammonium sulphate was used upto 10 ml. Yes. Yes, changed. Changed. Boiled for 10 minutes. Changed. 2 ml concoction. Yes. Title 3.2.1 changed. Yes. Changed in the manuscript. Title changed. **It is for concoction** Calulax was an **ayurvedic tablet used as standard** after dissolving in DMSO Three samples used (Standard, Negative control and Concoction) Yes. Included in the text Yes.Included in the text.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	No issues