



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JPRI_62367
Title of the Manuscript:	Extracted trans-resveratrol from Arachis hypogaea enhances expression of sirtuin gene and replicative life span in Saccharomyces cerevisiae
Type of the Article	Original 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In some places throughout manuscript abbreviation was used but it is mandatory to give full form of abbreviation. 2. Revision is required in Introduction. The introduction was just like simply writing some paragraph. It is not clear as per matter of manuscript. 3. So many spelling, grammatical and topographical error through out the manuscript. 4. The literature part of previous study, aim and objective and out come of study to society is missing in Introduction. 5. Modifications is highly recommended in the Introduction. 6. Plant was naturally infected from source or infection was induced artificially. If infection induced please provide reference. 7. Extraction of resveratrol is new process or already established. If process is established ne then provide references. 8. In HPLC analysis Methanol is used than why ethanol is used in extraction process 9. Is the method was newly developed or referred some previous work. The method seems like collected from some previous work. Provide necessary references. 10. The detection wave length is not clear through out manuscript mention exact wave length and also produce the spectrum of standard. 11. Fig-1 of chromatogram what was tailing factor it seems like tailing factr must be more than 2 which is not acceptable. 12. Fig-2 and 7 bar diagram should be describe statistically currently it is not clear. 13. Revision is required in references as per journal format. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the problem encountered in previous study ? 2. What is the novelty of present study for the society ? 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandip Sen
Department, University & Country	Srikrupa Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, India