

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
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.	The manuscript provides evidence of the scientific properties of <i>Carissa edulis</i> (<i>C. edulis</i>) which is widely used as in traditional medicine for treatment of various illness. The study provide a scientific backing to its viability in using it for treatment of ailments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable	
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.	The abstract presented in 255 words is within the recommended range and summarizes well the key areas of the study.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The introduction although thorough in discussing themes around the study does not capture the objectives and research questions clearly for proper reference and guidance. The objective and research questions will provide a clearer overview of what the study was commissioned for and if that was met.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is a sufficient, well-captured reference	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English writing is clear for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Well-articulated writing, but the structure of the introduction section can be improved to include the objectives and research questions.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jacob Oche Attah
Department, University & Country	University of Maiduguri, Nigeria