

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_122185
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Anti-Ulcerogenic Effects of Ethanol extract and Fractions of <i>Dialium guineense</i> stem bark in Ethanol-Induced peptic ulcer in Albino Rats.
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Today, ulcers are the most common problem worldwide. There are lots of marketed synthetic drugs available to treat this problem, but due to their adverse effects and high cost, the choice of herbal medicine is increasing day by day. This research article helps to find out the antiulcer property of <i>Dialium guineense</i> stem bark as a herbal agent.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	Abstract is not appropriate. The methodology, the results and the conclusion are not properly given in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	In the methodology part, the name of the model and anti-ulcer model details are not given properly. Utilisation of a total 160 pieces of animal (as given in the manuscript) is not given properly. In the results part, values are marked by using alphabets, but the significance of alphabets is not given properly.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Cover, T.L., and Blaser, M.J. (2020). Helicobacter pylori and other gastric Helicobacter species. In: Bennett JE, Dolin R, Blaser MJ, eds. Mandell, This reference is not in appropriate format.	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prodip Roy
Department, University & Country	Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose Institute of Pharmacy, India