

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_70576
Title of the Manuscript:	Study the Efficacy of Rodhradiganavasti in the Management of Sthaulya (Overweight)
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Introduction recent statistical data on Obesity needs to be incorporated</li> <li>2. Important Ayurvedic technical terminologies should have the equivalent English meanings in the bracket ex Nindita purusha</li> <li>3. Define niruha basti initially before using it repeatedly through out the paper</li> <li>4. Club all the Objectives in a single point</li> <li>5. Patient Selection from indoor and outdoor is not appropriate sentence- Name of the institution should be mentioned</li> <li>6. Current treatment choices as per conventional medicine is not described in the review of literature and hence cannot be taken for discussion</li> <li>7. In the reference section name of the journal need not be in capitals</li> <li>8. Mode of action of drugs is highlighted but the mode of action of the Basti as a therapeutic procedure is not much highlighted- It has to be added.</li> <li>9. In conclusion, recommendations for further also to be added as the number of patients is just 15, the significance obtained is not much conclusive and reliable.</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction should be simple, complicated sentences like "The general inescapability of strength fundamentally expanded some place in the scope of 1975 and 2016" could be altered</li> <li>2. Grammatical mistakes needs correction</li> <li>3. Word spacing throughout the manuscript needs correction</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

## Review Form 1.6

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:	<b><i>Pallavi. G</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>NTR University of Health Sciences, India</i></b>