

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 Dialium guineense stem bark in Ethanol-Induced peptic ulcer in Albino Rats.
Type of the 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.	The manuscript is not important and not well written The methods they used and written are different They haven't done this properly	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested title: Estimation of Anti-Ulcerogenic, Anti inflammatory and Anti oxidant property of Ethanolic extract of <i>Dialium guineense</i> stem bark in Ethanol-Induced peptic ulcer in Albino Rats.	
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 was not included the anti oxidant and anti inflammatory studies	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	not well written	
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.	The methods they used and written are different They are not included the extraction and isolation process of fractions of what they used to estimate (from the plant), but they added in results "as F1, F2,F3,F4,F5, F6"	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The author not included the reference number instated he added <i>et al</i> , year	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Rajender Arutla
Department, University & Country	Satavahana University, India