

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_130102
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioactivity and Safety of hydro-ethanolic Lyophilised Carrisa edulis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, overall, it is an interesting and useful article. I have announced my comments below.	noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title of the article is simple and would be better if it were changed. For example, the word "hydro-ethanolic Lyophilised" would be removed and stated in the text. The application and region (country) can also be used in the article title. Of course, It is better to change the title of the article by the respected author because it is his idea and thought, and the related articles that he has reviewed can help him/her.	noted
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It would be better if the writing were changed. Explain the purpose of the work, and how it differs from other work. The "abstract" is more like an introduction.	noted
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The research background is not used in the "Introduction". Certainly, many studies and researches have been conducted and each of them have obtained results, none of which have been mentioned here. I suggest you use the studies and experiences of other researchers and bring them here. Then tell about your work and mention the difference between your work and other researches and explain the importance of your work.  The arrangement of the "material and methods" is appropriate.  In "conclusion", it is better to include information about limitations and future directions. The conclusion is very brief.  Altogether, the sentences are appropriate and scientifically a good work has been done.	noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are new references. But as it was said in the previous section, it is better to add the sources related to the relevant research (research background).	noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, overall, the sentences are appropriate.	noted
<u>Optional/General comments</u>	In the "introduction", only one figure is observed and no other figures or diagrams are used. In the "Materials and methods", no figures or diagrams are used. It would be better to include figures of the process. The quality of the figures and tables in the “discussion and conclusion” is not good.	noted

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues noted