

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_112221
Title of the Manuscript:	Khuzāma (Lavandula angustifolia Mill.): Pharmacological Action and Therapeutic uses in perspective of Unani Medicine- a Review
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript in my opinion makes a valuable contribution to the scientific community from both biological and clinical perspectives. It is a timely contribution, given the emerging evidence regarding the Lavandula's wide-ranging therapeutic potentials, which this manuscript puts in valuable context within Unani Medicine. By taking this perspective, added value is offered to the scientific reader, delivering a more nuanced understanding of this classical system of healing. The title would indeed seem perfectly suitable, although I notice that it refers to one species discussed among several; nevertheless, the most important species therapeutically, and for that reason, the title is suitable, although widening it out to mention the genus as a whole might also be considered. The abstract would appear to be sufficiently comprehensive and well-rounded. The manuscript would indeed appear to be well-structured in terms of providing clear subsections pertinent to each perspective taken. Yes, the manuscript would, indeed, without investigating every citation, appear to be scientifically correct. The references would appear to be sufficient for the range of discussion applied, if not especially extensive. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the quality of English language is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriel Mojay
Department, University & Country	Institute of Traditional Herbal Medicine and Aromatherapy, USA