

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_113315</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sarwālī (Celosia cristata): Medicinal importance in perspective of Unani medicine and pharmacological studies</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>It is considered that they have scientific importance and relevance, especially due to the many contributions to solutions to cure so many medical pathologies. A plant that has so many uses is important to make known these essential characteristics of it</p> <p>"Pharmacological study of Sarwālī (Celosia cristata): importance in Unani medicine" is suggested, since we want to make known the importance of the use of this plant</p> <p>the applied methodology are missing, and the conclusions reached because the results are that it is the importance of the application of this plant in so many pathologies</p> <p>It has an introduction, a fairly summarized methodology, the results as observations, the conclusions and bibliographic references, these are the sections of any article.</p> <p>To comply with the essentially scientific objective, a documentary review was carried out where different literatures related to the topic from various authors were compared, which leads us to say that a documentary investigation was carried out to achieve this compendium of results that leads us to provide solutions for the control of known and not so known diseases</p> <p>It has a large reference number but most of them comply with the minimum of 5 years of validity, the most recent is from 2016 and has 8 years of expiration.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is the technical language that we all use.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ninoska Margarita Paz Palacios</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Bolivariana de Venezuela, Venezuela</b>