



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47264
Title of the Manuscript:	Interaction of cyclosporine with pomegranate juice and its potential nephroprotective effect in rats
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	The experimental design should be well stated and outlined. The groupings of the rats should be stated.	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract Line 2: What is P-gp? Line 4: *This study aims at examining* instead as *this study aims to examine* Lines 6-9 : Why two separate studies, one for 5 days and next study for 28 days? Line 6:The first dose of 20mg/kg of cyclosporine given for 5days , was it given daily? Line 6: Specify the route of administration used? Not orally or SC Line 6: What is SC? Line 7: Why the pomegranate or distilled water? Please specify *** NO number of male wistar rats used? Please specify for this research. Line 8-9 : Please explain vividly what you did. Who did you design your research work? Line 13; This study provided evidence On the other hand. Please the statement is incomplete. Line 14: Remove *prevented* Introduction Line 7: No citation after practice? Materials and Method Preparation of pomegranate juice: *** No Acute Toxicity testing(LD ₅₀ ***The experimental rats are not grouped and indication as to what group received what drug treatment. These should be stated. Histopathology assessment Line 3: remove *ded* a) Statistical analysis Line 5; check the spelling * Tukey's * Conclusion Line 4: repeated administration . OF what drug?	All corrections have been done based on the comments raised by the reviewer Corrections done Corrected Citation added Revised accordingly
	The statistical tables and the histological results figures should be brought within the body of the work for easier assessment, not in appendix except otherwise stated by the journal.	

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>	