

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_120891</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ANTIOXIDANT AND VASODILATORY PROPERTIES OF SCLEROCARYA BIRREA (A. Rich.) Hochst TRUNK'S EXTRACTS (ANACARDIACEAE)</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. Line 39: What is HTA? Kindly provide the full name before the abbreviations are mentioned	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>TITLE</b> The family name of the plant Should come after the name or authority before the extracts are mentioned	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<b>ABSTRACT</b> 2. Line 10: check grammatical error 3. Line 17: Effective concentrations of what?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b> 1. Line 63: Is Figure 1 showing the plant or the city of Ouagadougou? 2. Line 98: Which extracts? 3. Line 114: What's DAL? 4. Line 115-119: This could be moved to the discussion. Over here, the method is the only thing needed. 5. Line 151: ABTS or DPPH?	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	4. Line 247: This was not seen at the methods section 5. Line 253: Why was HPTLC used for a qualitative phytochemical screening? The chromatograms do not necessarily confirm the compounds present as claimed. A better method for phytochemical screening should be used for this assay 6. Line 277-284: This should come before the table 7. Line 291: How was the estimation done since the dose administered was 2000 mg/kg? 8. Line 294: Please check spellings 9. Line 297: What's the meaning of superimposable in that context? 10. Line 302: How was this done? Were the experimental animals given pre-weighed food? Is this part of the OECD guidelines? 11. Line 310: How was this done? Were the experimental animals given pre-measured water? Is this part of the OECD guidelines?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	12. Line 382: What is THR?	

**Review Form 3**

<p>=</p>	<p>13. Line 384: Which vegetable powder? What's the relevance of this study?</p> <p>14. Line 387: Isn't the moisture content dependent on the drying techniques and duration employed by the researcher?</p> <p>15. Line 409: What was DAL compared to?</p> <p>16. Line 416: How many extracts were studied?</p> <p>17. Line 440: Which part of the plant?</p> <p>18.</p> <p>Based on the above, I do not recommend the manuscript for publication.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The authors investigated antioxidant and vasodilatory properties of <i>sclerocarya birrea</i> (a. rich.) hochst trunk's extracts (anacardiaceae). The rationale behind the study is outlined at both the abstract and introduction sections of the manuscript. The mode of preparation of the plant for traditional use, literature review and other necessary information of the plant were not provided.</p> <p>There is no rational for carrying out some experiments in relation to the title of the study. For instance, the acute toxicity experiment isn't relevant because if the plant is used to treat hypertension, then a chronic toxicity study is recommended since the drug would be taken for a long time. Also, indicators such as food and water consumption hasn't been outlined in the OECD method selected for the toxicity studies.</p> <p>Furthermore, the antioxidant assays were not justified as to its purpose in this study. There were mentioning of various extracts, yet only one extract was prepared in the study. Some of the methods used are scientifically questionable and their use should be justified (phytochemical screening).</p> <p>There are few typos and grammatical errors which ought to be checked. Long sentences should be avoided and short sentences used.</p> <p>The work, if/when justified appropriately is good for publication. Below are some suggested revisions to be considered:</p> <p><b>Major concerns:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The traditional mode of preparation of the drug for use should be mentioned.</li> <li>2. All other methods which are not captured in the title should be justified for their inclusion.</li> <li>3. Methods for phytochemical screening and acute toxicity should be scientifically unquestionable.</li> <li>4. Antioxidant assays should be justified on their inclusion</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Desmond Nkrumah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b>