

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_120012
Title of the Manuscript:	The Oxytocic and Abortifacient Activities of <i>Xylopi</i> <i>Aethiopica</i> Ethanol Fruit Extract on Female Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance to the Scientific Community: The manuscript addresses a relevant and vital issue in the field, making a noteworthy contribution to the scientific community. The research offers significant insights that will be valuable for advancing knowledge and understanding in this field. 2. Suitability of the Title: The title accurately reflects the manuscript's content and effectively communicates the focus of the study. It captures the essence of the research and will attract the attention of the appropriate audience. 3. Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, summarizing the key objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It effectively communicates the significance of the research. However, the keywords section should include the scientific name of the medicinal plant studied to enhance discoverability. 4. Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: The manuscript is well-organized, with subsections that appropriately divide the content. The logical flow of the structure enhances readability. Nevertheless, the conclusion is too brief. It should include more detailed results and perspectives to provide a more thorough summation of the study. 5. Scientific Accuracy: The scientific content of the manuscript is accurate, with methods and results that are well-supported. It is important to italicize the scientific names of medicinal plants throughout the manuscript for proper scientific formatting. 6. References: While the references provided are sufficient, I recommend updating them to include more recent publications to enhance the relevance of the literature review. Also, ensure that all plant scientific names in the references are italicized for uniformity. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and overall quality of English are suitable for scholarly communication. However, significant proofreading is required to address grammatical errors, improve sentence structure, and enhance overall clarity. While some corrections have been made to improve comprehensibility, additional proofreading is essential for a polished final version.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	I believe that with the necessary revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the scientific literature.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	Naima Fatehi
Department, University & Country	Algeria