

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	<u>Advanced Concepts in Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BP_12349F
Title of the Manuscript:	FRUIT PEEL EXTRACTS WITH POTENTIAL FOR DISSOLVING SIMULATED RENAL STONES IN IN VITRO CONDITIONS
Type of the Article	Book chapter

BPI Review Form 070520

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes, Because it has a medical relevance, This research provides a invasive method to treat kidney stone without pain and it is a cost effective method	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, Identification of active compounds using fruit peel extract to diagnose renal stones invitro condition	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	No, Several grammatical and syntax error, require rewriting of statements.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	<p>Title: The title clearly states the objective of the study, which is evaluating fruit peel extracts for their potential to dissolve simulated renal stones. It effectively communicates the focus of the research.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract succinctly summarizes the key aspects of the study, including the objective, methods, results, and conclusion. It provides a clear overview of the research findings and their significance.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction provides relevant background information on the use of plants in traditional medicine and the potential therapeutic benefits of fruit peels. It also outlines the prevalence of kidney stones and the rationale for the study. However, it could be streamlined to focus more directly on the specific aims of the research.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: This section provides detailed information on the materials used and the experimental procedures followed, including extraction methods, preliminary screening, and the preparation of simulated renal stones. The inclusion of figures and tables enhances the clarity of the methods.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: The results are presented clearly, with tables and figures to support the findings. The discussion effectively interprets the results in the context of the research objectives and previous literature. However, it could benefit from more critical analysis and comparison with existing studies.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion summarizes the key findings of the study and suggests potential applications in the treatment of renal stones. It appropriately highlights the need for further research to validate the in vitro findings in vivo.</p> <p>References: The references cited are relevant and provide support for the study's background and rationale. However, some references appear to be incomplete (e.g., missing page numbers), and formatting inconsistencies should be addressed.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript appears to be well-prepared and provides valuable insights into the potential antiurolithiatic activity of fruit peel extracts. With some minor revisions for</p>	

BPI Review Form 070520

	clarity and completeness, it could be suitable for publication.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	No require more references based on the theme in recent five years. The paper covers only references upto 2018	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Neelesh Kapoor
Department, University & Country	College of Biotechnology, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, India