



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_34369
Title of the Manuscript:	RAT SERUM ELECTROLYTE AND LIPID PROFILE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATION OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF SPHENOSTYLIS STENOCARPA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	What is the family and the who is the taxonomist? L 31 – replace occurring with a suitable word L 33- Locally know as” is better L 34 – after “Usakku” add an “and” L 39 – “like that” – is not scientific English L 40 – replace word “those” with that I tried to improve grammar. But there are too many mistakes. Please get a native English speaker to correct the paper L 83 and 84 should be deleted or should come under material Forced feeding should be replaced with gavaging Are they males or females? Did authors obtain ethical approval> What is the time of administration? Why days 3, 7 and 10? It is not clear whether authors collect blood after	The taxonomist is an employee of Enugu State Ministry of Agriculture. L 31-Occurring replaced with cultivated as highlighted in yellow. L34 –“and” added L39 – “like that” replaced with “same as”. L40 – “those” replaced with “that” The authors speak English very very well. L83 and 84 are under material Forced feeding replaced with gavaging. They are male and female and has been corrected. Ethical approval has been added. The authors fed for 3, 7 and 10 days because the short term effects of the extract were being investigated as the extract is meant to be taken daily. The authors feel that there was a significant difference from the short duration of the study



SDI Review Form 1.6

	each treatment Statistical analysis – ANOVA – followed by what test? What is the significant level> It seems this is not aqueous extract as they have used the brewed water. Potassium values are too close to be significant. Are author sure about this? So is cholesterol. If the weights of the rats were not decreased, how can the decrease in cholesterol levels can be due to anti-nutritional factors? Explain 1. Rangika, BS, Dayananda D. Peiris LDC (2015). Hypoglycemic and hypolipidemic activities of aqueous extract of flowers from <i>Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</i> L. in mice. BMC complementary and Alternative Medicine. 15 (289); Article ID: 10.1186/s12906-015-0807-0. You can refer above paper to refer the reasons for cholesterol decrease. Can be used as a reference What is the future prospective of the study?	1. Thank you for that. Authors are grateful. The reference (Rangika et al) ref: [29] has been added in the discussion and highlighted in yellow. 2. Authors have also added another reference (Uchegbu NN) ref: [28] in discussion as highlighted in yellow. The future of this study is very exciting. Some clinics have expressed interest and human studies have begun with patients of the clinics but there are challenges of getting enough volunteers.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		