



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_20551
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on Barleria prionitis: its pharmacognosy, phytochemicals and traditional use
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	1. The author didn't mention environmental ecology (or environmental growth conditions) of the plant growth. 2. No. 4.1 to 4.19, I think better discuss first each of the type of activities in detail before discuss function of the plant on each activity. 3. That is better if the author can provide the mechanism on how active compounds in the extract function in each activity. 4. The author didn't discuss why needs to use different solvents of extraction to prepare the extract. 5. The author didn't mention why different part of plant shows different compounds present or different use. The author needs to discuss in detail the information from identified reference.	Ans 1 Environmental ecology this plant is not the topic of this review. So, we not included it. Ans 2 All of the activities are well established and well described in their main research articles which are inserted in reference section. So, as a review paper, these activities are not discussed further. Ans 3 The description of the mode of action of each phytochemical individually is not compatible with the aim of this review. Ans 4 This review mainly compiled several pharmacognostical results from those articles but most of these papers provided inadequate information of the basis of the choice of any specific solvents and extracts. Ans 5 Most of the main articles did not provide any explanation why different parts show different compounds. As a result, we did not include any explication.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The author didn't explain each of the given table in detail.	All tables are the summary of pharmaconnostical, phytochemical properties and traditional use. As a result we did not provide detailed explanation.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		