



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_29997
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Antioxidant, Phytochemical and Proximate Properties of Ethanolic Extracts of Morinda lucida.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract should be rewritten, clearly mentioning the points: background and objectives, materials and methods, key findings, conclusions and featuring. <i>Morinda lucida</i> can be written as <i>M. lucida</i> after first appearing, as it comes three or more than three times in a section. Starting letters of the phytochemical groups and inorganic components will be small letter. Keywords should be rewritten. Most of them are non-acceptable. It is not wise to keep the family name here. Botanical name should be italic. Joint words, 'and' 'of' --- are not acceptable. 'in-vitro-antioxidant' is not a correct form. More specific keywords should be selected. Introduction is not well-presented. Problems in writing of sentences and placing of references. The author(s) can separately write the current problems, adequate background and his/their aim and objectives in this section. Materials and methods section should be organized. Placement of items and sentence making problems are crucial in this regard. Author(s) can attach the voucher specimen number. How the extracts were concentrated? The quantitative and qualitative methods of phytochemical analysis should be clearly described. Ferrous chelation test should be placed after superoxide anion test. Result section is badly presented. Should be rewritten again. Tables and figures are not prepared in standard form. Many of them contain no title/legends. Item-wise placement of results is more preferable. Discussion should be connected towards the results/findings. The term 'antinutrient' is quite strange. Author(s) can use phytoconstituents or something like that. Conclusion should provide the answer of aim and objectives of the study, findings in short and author's/authors' featuring.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Why the author(s) place the sections: recommendation, consent and ethical approval? In place of them aren't wise to write acknowledgement and conflict of interest sections? Most of the headings should be rewritten with correct numbering. References are not in a similar format. I think these will not meet the journal's standard. The author(s) is/are investigated phytochemical and antioxidant capacities of this plant extracts (stem, root and leaf). Therefore, the title should be changed and fitted accordingly. Grammar should be checked throughout the text. Presentation is not satisfactory. It seems the author(s) is/are writing manuscript for the first time. Please discuss the matter with the specialist or teachers of the department.	
Minor REVISION comments	Rewriting is recommended.	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have follow VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Toregul islam
Department, University & Country	Department of Pharmacy, Southern University, Bangladesh