

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_125457
Title of the Manuscript:	Subacute toxicity study of Alchornea Cordifolia ethanolic leaf extract on the pituitary gland of Wistar rats.
Type of the Article	Original 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is very informative and useful. It will definitely increase the knowledge of the researcher , and will encourage the scholars to work in this field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	From my point of view the title of the artice 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.	Yes, the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate.	
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.	From my point of view the quality of the picture can be improved. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound , and the result are presented in a clear and concise manner. The authors also discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Most of the references are recent and they are sufficient to describe the content of the manuscript.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good quality of English language.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Manjeet Kumar Yadav
Department, University & Country	Mata Raj Kaur College Rewari, India