



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_31357
Title of the Manuscript:	HEPATOPROTECTIVE EFFECT OF AQUEOUS BARK EXTRACT OF BOSWELLIA DALZIELLI AGAINST PARACETAMOL INDUCED HEPATOTOXICITY IN RABBITS
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	Result and discussion Author should separate the discussion from the result and improve the result section.	The result has been separated from the discussion. Thought it can be merged. Thank you
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract Line 13: data was were Introduction Line 14-17: these lines need to be recast Line 25: the plant is regarded as 4 a veritable sources (author should explain the highlighted phrase) Preparation of plant extract Line 1: exactly 50 g of the dried..... (author should not start paragraph/sentence with number) Line 1: bBoswellia dalzielii Line 3: which lasted for 13 days Preparation of paracetamol extract tablet Line 1: Exactly 5 g of powdered (author should not start paragraph/sentence with number)	Line 14-17: has been recasted. Line 25: the appearance of 4 is a typographical error. All corrections have been effected.
Optional/General comments	Author should separate the discussion from the result and improve the discussion section. The references should be formatted according to the journal format.	It has been separated.

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

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>