



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJPR/1994
Title of the Manuscript:	Immunomodulatory effects of aqueous extracts of <i>Auricularia</i> sp and <i>Pleurotus</i> sp mushrooms in cyclophosphamide-immunosuppressed Wistar rats

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	The objective of this study is well defined and important. Materials and methods are suitable and sufficient. Data are presented well controlled and adequately referenced. Results and Discussion is based on actual experimental data without bias.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The statistical analysis need to be extended by comparing the mean values of Group II vs VI and of the Group IV vs VII of the days 0,14&28 and for all parameters tested (Tables,1-3). This will indicate possible different effects of immunonutrition in immunosuppressed and normal subjects under the same dose of mushroom extracts. Also comparison should be made between subjects with and without immunonutrition on different doses of the same mushroom extract.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	On 2.4 Experimental design, line 86 Group III is missing and should be inserted. Immunomodulation should have taken into account except WBC, other important Cytokines like IL-2, IL12, NK cells, LAK etc. (This suggestion is for future completion of this work)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr. Cleanthes Israilides
Department, University & Country	Institute of Technology of Agricultural Products, National Agricultural Research Foundation (NAGREF), Greece