



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57825

Title: "Guduchi : The Wonder Drug and Its Multifaceted Role in Panchakarma Management - From Shodhana to Rejuvenation"

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

**Accept after major revision .....YES**

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity			√	
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-094

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

#### ### Reviewer's Report

#### ## Overall Assessment

This manuscript presents a narrative review of *Tinospora cordifolia* (Guduchi), emphasizing its Ayurvedic properties, phytochemical constituents, pharmacological activities, therapeutic applications, and role in Panchakarma procedures. The topic is relevant to Ayurveda and integrative medicine; however, the review largely compiles already published information and lacks a clearly defined methodology, critical analysis, and substantial novelty.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### ## Strengths

#### ### 1. Comprehensive Coverage

- \* Covers Ayurvedic concepts, classical references, pharmacological activities, phytochemistry, therapeutic applications, safety profile, and Panchakarma relevance.
- \* Provides extensive tabular presentation of formulations and Panchakarma applications.

#### ### 2. Integration of Classical and Modern Knowledge

- \* Attempts to correlate Ayurvedic concepts such as Rasayana, Ama, Agni, Ojas, and Shodhana with modern pharmacological mechanisms.
- \* Bridges traditional Ayurvedic literature with contemporary scientific findings.

#### ### 3. Educational Value

- \* Useful as a reference document for Ayurveda students, practitioners, and researchers.
- \* Summarizes scattered information into a single review.

#### ### 4. Inclusion of Safety Considerations

- \* Discusses adverse effects and recent concerns regarding Guduchi-associated hepatotoxicity.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### **## Weaknesses**

### **### Major Weaknesses**

#### **#### 1. Lack of Novelty**

\* The manuscript is primarily descriptive and reiterates information already available in numerous reviews on Guduchi.

\* No new clinical evidence, experimental findings, systematic review methodology, or meta-analysis is presented.

#### **#### 2. Absence of Review Methodology**

\* Search strategy, databases searched, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and study selection process are not described.

\* The manuscript cannot be considered a systematic or evidence-based review.

#### **#### 3. Overstated Mechanistic Claims**

\* Section 14 proposes mechanisms involving:

\* Nrf2 activation

\* NF- $\kappa$ B inhibition

\* Autophagy regulation

\* Bcl-2/Bax modulation

\* Mitochondrial stabilization

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**These statements require stronger primary experimental evidence and more specific citations.**

### #### 4. Limited Critical Analysis

**\* Findings from studies are summarized without discussing:**

- \* Study quality**
- \* Limitations**
- \* Contradictory evidence**
- \* Translational relevance to humans**

### #### 5. Panchakarma Tables Need Verification

- \* Numerous formulations and references are listed.**
- \* Authenticity and exact textual citations require verification.**
- \* Some formulations appear to be listed without adequate contextual discussion.**

### ### Minor Weaknesses

#### #### 1. Formatting Issues

- \* Multiple spacing errors.**
- \* Inconsistent botanical nomenclature formatting.**
- \* Inconsistent citation style.**

#### #### 2. Repetition

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

\* Similar descriptions of Guduchi's immunomodulatory, antioxidant, and Rasayana properties appear repeatedly.

### #### 3. Language Issues

#### Examples:

\* "Guduchiactsas"

\* "Tinosporacordifolia"

\* "PanchakarmaChikitsa"

Several typographical and formatting corrections are required.

### #### 4. Reference Quality

\* Many references are old.

\* Recent clinical trials, systematic reviews, and pharmacovigilance studies are underrepresented.

### ## Key Points Requiring Revision

#### ### Major Revisions

1. Add a review methodology section.

2. Clearly define the novelty of the review.

3. Critically evaluate evidence rather than merely describing it.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Verify all classical references and Panchakarma formulations.
5. Strengthen mechanistic sections with appropriate supporting literature.
6. Include recent clinical evidence (last 5–10 years).
7. Discuss limitations of current evidence.

### ### Minor Revisions

1. Correct grammar and formatting.
2. Standardize Sanskrit terminology.
3. Improve table formatting.
4. Ensure uniform citation style.

### ## Scientific Significance

#### ### Positive Aspects

- \* Highlights the therapeutic potential of Guduchi.
- \* Explores Panchakarma applications in greater detail than many conventional herbal reviews.
- \* Supports interest in integrative and traditional medicine research.

#### ### Limitations Affecting Significance

- \* Primarily a compilation review.
- \* Limited original interpretation.
- \* Mechanistic discussions are speculative in several sections.
- \* Lack of evidence grading reduces scientific impact.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Overall Significance: Moderate\*\***

### **## Recommendation**

**### \*\*Major Revision\*\***

### **### Justification**

The manuscript addresses an important Ayurvedic medicinal plant and provides a broad overview of its role in Panchakarma and integrative medicine. However, significant improvements are required regarding scientific rigor, novelty, methodology, critical appraisal of evidence, verification of classical references, and substantiation of mechanistic claims before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

**\*\*Final Decision: Major Revision\*\*.**

### **Major Revision Justification (Reviewer Comments with Issue and Reason)**

#### **Recommendation: MAJOR REVISION**

Although the review article provides a comprehensive compilation of Ayurvedic and modern information on Guduchi (*Tinospora cordifolia*), several scientific, methodological, structural, and referencing deficiencies limit its suitability for publication in its current form.

<b>Section/Line</b>	<b>Issue Identified</b>	<b>Reason for Major Revision</b>
Title	Title is overly broad and promotional ("Wonder Drug").	Scientific manuscripts should avoid exaggerated claims and use objective terminology.
Lines 6–20	Abstract lacks methodology of	Review articles must explain

**REVIEWER'S REPORT**

<b>Section/Line</b>	<b>Issue Identified</b>	<b>Reason for Major Revision</b>
(Abstract)	literature search.	databases searched, inclusion criteria, and study selection process.
Lines 13–20	Claims regarding anticancer, cardioprotective, and neuroprotective effects are presented as established facts.	Most evidence originates from experimental studies; clinical evidence remains limited.
Keywords	Keywords are generic and insufficient for indexing.	More specific terms such as Panchakarma, Rasayana Therapy, <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> , Phytochemistry should be added.
Lines 26–53 (Introduction)	Introduction lacks clear rationale and research gap.	Readers cannot identify what novel contribution this review provides over previous reviews.
Lines 46–52	Modern pharmacological claims are not critically discussed.	Requires distinction between in vitro, animal, and human evidence.
Lines 54–66 (Background)	Background is descriptive without recent evidence synthesis.	More recent literature (2020–2025) should be incorporated.
Drug Review Table	Table merely reproduces standard textbook information.	Adds little scientific value and requires expansion with source citations.
Rasa Panchaka Table	No supporting classical references provided.	Ayurvedic properties should be referenced from authoritative texts.
Historical Review (Lines 75–83)	Extremely brief and superficial.	Historical review should include exact textual citations and context.
Lines 85–95 (Varieties)	Classification of varieties lacks scientific validation.	Requires botanical evidence and references supporting medicinal superiority claims.
Lines 93–95	Statement regarding Guduchi growing on Neem being superior is unsupported.	Scientific evidence or classical citation must be provided.
Lines 97–117 (Phytochemistry)	Constituents listed without concentration, extraction methods, or relevance.	Requires critical discussion rather than a simple list.
Lines 119–146	Entire section is descriptive.	No evaluation of evidence

**REVIEWER'S REPORT**

<b>Section/Line</b>	<b>Issue Identified</b>	<b>Reason for Major Revision</b>
(Pharmacological Actions)		quality, study design, or limitations.
Lines 120–146	Mechanistic explanations are oversimplified.	Modern molecular pathways and clinical relevance should be discussed.
Lines 148–220 (Role in Panchakarma)	Large number of formulations listed without analysis.	Tables are descriptive and do not explain therapeutic rationale.
Panchakarma Tables	Numerous formulations lack verification and standard referencing format.	Classical citations should be validated and uniformly formatted.
Lines 148–220	No evidence demonstrating efficacy of Guduchi specifically in Panchakarma settings.	Requires supporting clinical studies or observational evidence.
Nasya Section (Lines 206–208)	Relationship of Guduchi with listed Nasya formulations is unclear.	Some formulations may not contain Guduchi directly. Clarification needed.
Lines 217–220	Statements regarding recovery after detoxification are unsupported.	Clinical evidence should be cited.
Therapeutic Uses Section	Disease indications are listed without evidence hierarchy.	Requires classification based on classical, experimental, and clinical evidence.
Dosage Table	No source provided for dosage recommendations.	Dosage standards should cite pharmacopoeias or authoritative references.
Safety Profile (Lines 243–255)	Safety discussion is inadequate.	Recent reports of Guduchi-induced liver injury require detailed analysis.
Safety Section	Contraindications, herb-drug interactions, pregnancy/lactation safety omitted.	Important for clinical applicability.
Lines 256–304 (Mode of Action)	Several molecular mechanisms appear speculative.	Claims about autophagy, Nrf2 activation, cytokine modulation require direct evidence.
Lines 262–304	Ayurvedic concepts are directly equated with molecular mechanisms.	Such correlations require cautious interpretation and supporting references.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Section/Line	Issue Identified	Reason for Major Revision
Lines 265–293	Multiple mechanistic claims are not supported by primary experimental evidence.	Additional citations and critical appraisal needed.
Discussion (Lines 305–322)	Discussion mainly repeats previous sections.	Should critically analyze findings, contradictions, limitations, and future directions.
Discussion	No comparison with previous review articles.	Essential to establish novelty.
Discussion	No mention of challenges in standardization and quality control.	Important issue in herbal medicine research.
Conclusion	Conclusion is overly optimistic.	Should acknowledge limitations of current evidence.
References	Majority of references are old (1997–2015).	More recent studies and systematic reviews should be included.
References	Several citations are repeated.	Duplicate references reduce scholarly quality.
References	Citation style inconsistent.	Journal formatting guidelines should be followed.
Entire Manuscript	No methodology section for literature review.	Major deficiency for a review article.
Entire Manuscript	No PRISMA-style review framework or search strategy.	Reduces transparency and reproducibility.
Entire Manuscript	Excessive reliance on narrative description.	Requires critical analysis and evidence synthesis.
Entire Manuscript	Language and formatting inconsistencies (spacing, transliteration, italics).	Requires substantial editorial revision.
Entire Manuscript	Scientific names inconsistently formatted ( <i>Tinosporacordifolia</i> vs <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> ).	Botanical nomenclature must follow accepted standards.

### Strengths

Comprehensive coverage of Ayurvedic concepts related to Guduchi.

Inclusion of Panchakarma applications from classical texts.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Useful compilation of phytochemical and pharmacological information.

Inclusion of safety considerations.

Attempts to integrate Ayurvedic and modern scientific perspectives.

### Weaknesses

No systematic review methodology.

Lack of critical appraisal of evidence.

Overreliance on old references.

Several unsupported mechanistic claims.

Excessive descriptive tables without analytical discussion.

Weak discussion and novelty.

Insufficient evidence supporting Panchakarma-specific applications.

Inadequate safety evaluation.

### Key Points Requiring Revision

Add detailed literature search methodology.

Incorporate recent studies (2020–2025).

Critically evaluate evidence quality.

Verify all classical references and Panchakarma formulations.

Strengthen safety and hepatotoxicity discussion.

Remove speculative mechanistic interpretations unless directly supported.

Improve discussion with evidence synthesis and future research directions.

Standardize botanical nomenclature and citation formatting.

### Significance

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

The topic is clinically and academically relevant because Guduchi remains one of the most widely used Ayurvedic medicinal plants and plays an important role in Panchakarma practice. However, the manuscript currently functions primarily as a descriptive compilation rather than a rigorous scholarly review. Substantial revisions are necessary to improve scientific rigor and publication quality.

### **Editorial Decision: MAJOR REVISION**

The manuscript has potential value but requires substantial methodological strengthening, critical evidence appraisal, updated references, verification of claims, and improved scientific discussion before it can be considered for publication.