

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_120299
Title of the Manuscript:	Balchar (Nardostachys Jatamansi DC): Pharmacological action and therapeutic uses in perspective of unani medicine: A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article has significance in the scientific community and especially for the Indian subcontinent as it describes the therapeutic properties of Nardostachys jatamansi, which has a lot of social connotations in lot of communities as often regarded as one of the ancient herbs. This scientific exploration of indigenous medicine is of great value in legitimizing the practices. Thus, the article has high importance for the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable and covers all aspects. It is very apt for the type of review conducted.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is written well and covers all aspects of the review article properly. Based on the journal guidelines if space permits, more information can be added for better indexing value, since the abstract is only 150 words at present.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The distribution of the subsections and the overall structure of the article adhered to scientific standards and were of high level. The content of all sections were appropriate and the organization of the different headings was logical. The article was very detailed and it covered all aspects of the topic.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript follows the scientific method and the overall review and reporting of findings are technically sound. The review has been written expertly and the article has high value to the field of indigenous medicine, especially in the Indian subcontinent. Reviews like these are important to assess the scientific status of various alternate medicine and this current article is of high quality.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are sufficient and consistent. There are some minor errors in the reference list, but overall, they look pretty consistent. It would also be good to provide DOIs or URLs if possible, to increase the accessibility of the referenced sources.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language use in the article was decent; however, there were a lot of minor typos in the form of missing spaces, missing punctuations, etc. The language and narrative is good otherwise, it's just that the article needs a quick proofread by an English language expert to fix minor issues.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prakat Karki
Department, University & Country	CHRIST University, India