

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_110586
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Cecropia glaziovii gel on the healing process: influence on the balance between cytokines and growth factors
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	  1. <b>Yes, The manuscript is good and can help in understanding the use of the native plants in the wound healing process.</b>  2. <b>The title may be modified to elaborate the research done as-</b> Effects of Cecropia glaziovii topical gel on the wound healing process or Evaluation of Cecropia glaziovii on growth factors and cytokinins in wound healing  3. <b>Yes</b>  4. <b>The manuscript is missing Materials section and do provide the sources of the materials. The temperature mentioned for the drying of the leaves is</b> 3540 degree Centigrade which is questionable. Rationale of selection of methods, quantity of gel used, etc are not mentioned. The procedure used for extraction is not provided (Aqueous, methanolic, hydroalcoholic....). The formulation uses EDTA, which itself affects the cytokinins and the wound healing, No information is provided on this.  5. <b>The scientific data provided is adequate</b>  Additional references may added of articles which are cited for the similar research like - <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-475X.2008.00410.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-475X.2008.00410.x</a>  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-3768.1992.tb02170.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-3768.1992.tb02170.x</a>  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/lsm.1900150308">https://doi.org/10.1002/lsm.1900150308</a>	We agree with reviewer and the suggestions was made according to what was possible.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, There are several grammatical mistakes in the manuscript and sentence framing needs improvement.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article needs major revision before acceptance	

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	