

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_126995
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-OXIDANT ASSESSMENT OF PARSONSIA STRAMINEA HYDRO-ETHANOL STEM BARK EXTRACT
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 <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.	I feel like this manuscript written about the estimation of ANTI-OXIDANT OF <i>PARSONSIA STRAMINEA</i> bark is important for human health. We should move to alternates of pharmaceutical medicines because they one way or other cause harm to human body. Stem bark of <i>Parsonsia straminea</i> could be a potential natural alternative to available medicines.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive. There is no need of any kind of addition or deletion.	
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 my opinion, this manuscript is scientifically sound because the researcher thoroughly evaluated the bark extract from multiple angles. The researcher conducted various phytochemical tests and antioxidant assessments, which were quite impressive. The results derived from these tests and analyses were convincing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references were recent, although some were older.	
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 <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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rida Kanwal
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan