

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_98393</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Preclinical in vivo acute toxicity testing of hyrdoethanolic extracts of Ficus thiningii Blume (Moraceae) on Wistar rat models</b>
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Present study includes primary stage evaluation of medicinal plant. It is of utmost importance to put through data for a plant which is proposed to be beneficial for the human kind, though more importantly medicinal plant has to be non harmful. Acute toxicity study of this plant reveals the same.	
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title is suitable.	
<b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	Yes.	
<b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	I have some suggestions regarding length of methodology part where each test is described in inappropriately lengthy way.	
<b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	No issues scientifically. No suggestion.	
<b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	No additional issue specifically issue with information provided for each test to be done seems unnecessary.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, seems okay.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	None	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Jitendra Harjibhai Vaghela</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GMERS Medical College, India</b>