

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_103975
Title of the Manuscript:	An overview on health benefits of Withania somnifera (ashwagandha) in veterinary medicine
Type of the Article	Review 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://journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes 3. No 4. Yes 5. No 6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The information given into the manuscript is good and informative scientifically. However there are some suggestions to do in order to make the manuscript more attractive and informative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Abstract: The ideas from your abstract are not well organized and it does not bring out the context and intention of the review. I suggest you to write it with the following suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Objectives: One or two sentences describe the context and intention of the review. ➤ Material and methods: One or a few sentences provide a general picture of the methodological approach. ➤ Results: A few sentences describe main outcomes. ➤ Conclusions: One or two sentences present the conclusion (which is linked to the objectives). ➤ Write your abstract with 250 words in maximum ▪ Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Well state the problem and the reason for reviewing the literature. ▪ Body of the paper: I suggest you to add also a materials and methods section in the body of your paper. It should contains for example, information about: data sources (Bibliographic databases), search terms and search strategies, selection criteria (inclusion/exclusion of studies), the number of studies screened and the number of studies included, statistical methods of meta-analysis. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ndoe Guiaro Marcellin
Department, University & Country	Institute of Medical Research and Medicinal Plants Studies, Cameroon