



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28152
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors affecting radioprotective efficacy of Ocimum sanctum (Tulsi) extract in mice
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1. Full botanical plant names, including authorities, must be mentioned besides the local names (tulsi) and if existing, an English name. Please check also if your plant name corresponds to the latest revision in "The Plant List" (www.theplantlist.org). The official botanical plant names should preferably also be mentioned in the abstract. 2. This is an interesting topic and is important to further our knowledge. 3. In reference 2,6,9,11,12 you didn't mention issue no 4. Ref 10 is incomplete information 5. I don't understand why you are changing the parameter (solvents) in different season [graph successive solvent extraction vs yield] in fig 1a and 1b. parameters should	The English name and Scientific name of "Tulsi" are already included in the text. Thanks for the kind comment. Issue has been addressed. Reference completed. Please note that water extract of 3 seasons (TWS, TWM and TWW) are compared and one ethanolic extract from winter season with high orientin content is described along with to show its relatively poor bioefficacy despite of high orientin content. The authors felt it is a good study design. Details of this important quarry has been addressed in the text for better understanding by the readers.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be same. 6. Results and discussion are poorly written.	Results and discussion part has been sufficiently improved as suggested.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		