

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_121838</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of the Potential Mechanisms of Anti-diarrhoeal Activities of ethanol extract of Polyantha logofolia Leave in Wistar Rat.</b>
Type of the 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: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The name of authors mentioned in the abstract like Harbone (1998), Trease and Evans, Bartels and Bohmer, are missing in References. 2. Tables descriptions and formatting could be improved like superscript mentioned in the tables may be elaborated below in each table. 3. Results can be elaborated in graphical way where needed, which will help in understanding the outcome more clearly. 4. A more mechanistic discussion could be written. Just comparative analysis of literature does not feel suitable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Syed Saleem Ahmad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Pakistan</b>