



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_50813
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacological screening for CNS Depression, analgesic and anti-inflammatory potentials of Sonneratia caseolaris (Linn.) barks in different solvent fraction
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	<p>From your abstract, Thhe conclusive remark,.. the plant part has remarkable antioxidant capacities.. Kindly do the total antioxidant capacity assay to ascertain your conclusion.. The result is mandatory. The activities are predictable to the phyto-constituents—You need also to ascertain this by doing phytochemical analysis which very necessary while you are qualifying medicinal value of a plant</p> <p>Rewrite your abstract afresh not more than 250 words</p> <p>From your conclusion—235- your are ascertaining ethnopharmacological claims, such statements should be in your abstract. Your conclusion .5. should be Conclusion and Recommendations as per your conclusive wordings. Line-237.. should be bioactive constituents NOT principles.</p> <p>Discussion. It should be subjective more to your data analysis findings than evidential report from a reference. Kindly review your discussion.. it should be 70-80% basing on your scientific data obtained. Clinical trial protocol and ethical principle statements should be well documented in your article.</p>	<p>I have rewrited my abstract.</p> <p>Has been corrected.</p> <p>Has been rewrited.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Minor Revision comments, Review your grammatical sentences once more.</p> <p>Declaration Statement: I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer</p>	I have trited.
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	