

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_124583
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant and cytotoxic potential of methanolic extracts of Beta vulgaris and Daucus carota against breast cancer cell line
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	Through its title, we expect to see a great deal of data in this manuscript that will help to advance science, especially in the face of this pathology that is causing so much damage throughout the world, except that this is not the case. The citations in the body of the text do not comply with the standards for certain parts, as in the case of 2.3.b. Methanolic Extract.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is appropriate, I find no ambiguity.	
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 preamble is too much for a summary, so I suggest you cut it down or go straight to the point. Also there is a repetition of the word cancer for the different cancers, one will suffice. Regarding the results, you could give the most attractive results, for example the highest flavonoid content found in the extracts. Finally, I can't quite make out the conclusion, which is an essential part of the summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub-sections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate although the results and discussion sections could be put in a single point.	
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 results are incomplete and misunderstood, i.e. the data are not sufficient for discussion. In addition, the discussion aspect (the why) of the manuscript is missing. The results should be reviewed in order to explain the importance of carrot and beetroot consumption. In short, this manuscript is not technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are acceptable with some old dates (WHO 2004) but the data is updated annually. It will therefore be necessary to adopt a single writing style for the references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language and scientific English is adapted to the research community.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Thiombiano Mendiempo Hyacinthe
Department, University & Country	University Nazi Boni, Burkina Faso