



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28152
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors affecting radioprotective efficacy of Ocimum sanctum (Tulsi) extract in mice
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://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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The references used are current and require to be formatted appropriately as required by the Journal.	Appropriately formatted as per the journal requirement.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author needs to introduce a comma after the highlighted sentence in the introduction. Line: 238-240 The sentence starting with Radioprotection does not make sense. Please revise it. (see it highlighted). Moreover, the author makes a string assertion in the discussion which is highlighted that there is a string Line 255-258: "Taken together, results of the present studies strongly suggest that the method of extraction, the choice of solvent, the geographical location of the raw plant material (that determines the nature of the soil and nutrition, besides the associated microbes) and the season of collection of Tulsi leaves significantly influence the bio efficacy (radioprotection) of the preparation" Interpreted statistically from this findings is the assertion that there is a strong interaction between the method of extraction, solvent type, geographical source , types of microbes and season for which the plant has been collected.	Agreed and changed accordingly. Revised as suggested, The part written was meant to show a possible relation of various factors with the desired bioefficacy obtained and not to make a confirmed statement as it appeared in the text previously. Now after revision the part has been considered as part of "conclusion" and is re-written to overcome the ambiguity that was observed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	This data has not been shown since this ought have been supported by the collection of plant materials from different geographical sources. Moreover, the data ought have been analysed using a regression model for interaction between the geography, solvent type, season and significant values for interaction provided here in the result section which is missing. The authors need to show how the interactions were arrived at and provide the significance as alluded by this statement.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper however comprehensively describes the radio protective nature of the herbal preparations on the prevailing conditions as set in this study.	The authors express thanks for the nice comment.