

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_76962
Title of the Manuscript:	Pterocarpus soyauxii (Fabaceae) heartwood aqueous extract exhibits anti-osteoporotic activities in a postmenopausal-like model
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for asking my opinion about the manuscript entitled "Pterocarpus soyauxii (Fabaceae) heartwood aqueous extract exhibits anti-osteoporotic activities in a postmenopausal-like model" This manuscript aims to evaluate anti-osteoporotic activities of the aqueous extract of P. soyauxii heartwood in ovariectomized (Ovx) Wistar rats. I believe that this manuscript should be major revision:</p> <p>The aim of this study (Page 1- Abstract) was there to evaluate anti-osteoporotic activities of the aqueous extract of P. soyauxii heartwood in ovariectomized (Ovx) Wistar rats. To identify the factors leading to poor adherence to Insulin therapy among diabetic patients. There were several good things about the paper, such as aim good. But the abstract should be reformulated and the objective of the study should be well highlighted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is untidy and needs to be paraphrasing. 2. The introduction is very short? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. In the introduction, include the significance of the study as well as novelty. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge? 2.1. In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explain why this study was conducted. 3. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased. 4. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed. 	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali B. Roomi
Department, University & Country	Al-Ayen University, Iraq