

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_100442</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Anti-Arthritic effect of the aqueous extracts of the roots and barks of Gossypium herbaceus in Complete Freund's adjuvant induced arthritis in female wistar rats</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research</b>

### **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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. It is addressing the RA which is currently a global incapacitating disease with only symptomatic relief</b> <b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>No. The abstract has to be rewritten since it is too vague and ambiguous</b> <b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>There are 4 vital issues to be clarified on part of the author</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Invitro lipid peroxidation method reflects antioxidant status not anti-inflammatory activity directly</b></li> <li>2. <b>The reference article based on which this method has been adopted seems to be for antioxidant activity determination. (Arbos, K.A, Prasanth, k)</b></li> <li>3. <b>It is written it is invitro lipid peroxidation method but the procedure is that of invivo method using rats from which liver has been excised and procedure is not clearly or ethically addressed</b></li> <li>4. <b>Invitro HRBC method uses human blood but here also but the procedure is that of invivo method using rats from which blood has been collected and this also not clearly or ethically addressed.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Mismatch in the methods and inference from these two references</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Arbos, K.A., Ligia, M.C., Lucielly, B., Cid, A.M., Almeriane, M. 2008. Human erythrocytes as a system for evaluating the antioxidant capacity of vegetable extracts. Nutrition Research, 28(7): 457-463.)</b></li> <li>2. <b>Prasanth, k., Shasidhara, S., Kumar, M., Sridhara, B. 2000. Effect of Luffa echinata on lipid oxidation and free radical scavenging activity. Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology, 52(7): 891-894.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>There is mismatch in number of animals used in abstract and manuscript</b> <b>Invitro methods describes use of rats for which detailed description and procedure with ethical clearance has to be addressed</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	English quality is good but requires better scientific input	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>To define the objectives clearly</b></li> <li>2. <b>To mention the route of drug administration</b></li> <li>3. <b>Figure 3 and 5 title to be written elaborately</b></li> <li>4. <b>To check spelling in Figure 4 title</b></li> </ol>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>R Vimalavathini</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mother Theresa Post graduate and Research Institute of Health Science, India</b>