

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_102384
Title of the Manuscript:	The Phytochemical and Nutritional Constituents of Leaf Extracts of Two Edible Medicinal Plants in Nigeria: A Comparative Appraisal
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 „**lac k of N o v elty**“, 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)
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. It contains data related to important phytochemicals and nutrients. In future this study will be helpful in drug formation. Title should not start with definite article "The". Title should be attention grabbing. Structure of the abstract lacks research problem, Research methodology and conclusion. Yes, appropriate. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. References should be up-to-date. <p>Other suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In introduction provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work done. Don't start sentence using pronouns like "they" or like "This was done". Use proper sentences. Check spelling mistakes. Results lack statistical analysis. Provide results in graphs, images, ANOVA and correlation. Discussion needs improvement. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English needs improvement.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Zubaida Yousaf
Department, University & Country	Lahore College for Women University, Pakistan