

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_117292
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of In-vitro Anti-arthritis, Anti-inflammatory, Anti-fungal, Thrombolytic, Membrane Stabilizing and Cytotoxic properties of Camellia chrysantha (Hu) Tuyama
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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1- <b>Yes it could be useful showing the road to more detailed and in deep future studies.</b></p> <p>2- The title needs to be "Evaluation of <i>In vitro</i> Anti-inflammatory, Anti-fungal, Thrombolytic, Membrane Stabilizing and Cytotoxic properties of <i>Camellia chrysantha</i> (Hu) Tuyama " Remove anti-arthritis and make in vitro italic</p> <p>3- <b>The abstract was too long but not comprehensive as there is no conclusion nor recommendations</b></p> <p>4- <b>Yes except for Section 2.6 and 2.7 which involved unnecessary subsections</b></p> <p>5- <b>Yes</b></p> <p>6- <b>The reference are not sufficient as many statements and information needs a reference. Most of the presented references are recent.</b></p>	<p>Checked</p> <p>Updated</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language was weak and sound like a software translation; need to be revised and re-write</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>1- Introduction was very brief, it is not covering the details of title</p> <p>2- There are more specific tests for evaluation of anti-arthritis activity than protein denaturation. Methods like Freund's adjuvant, Carrageenan- induced arthritis, Collagen - induced arthritis,... etc may be better to be consider.</p> <p>3- The pharmacological classification of Diclofenac is NSAIDs not " anti-arthritis" !!</p> <p>4- The author did not mention the reference number in order of appearance in text, for example jump from reference 4 to reference 12 in next paragraph without refering to references (5 -11).</p> <p>5- The author should be consistent in style of in-text citation and in writing of reference list ( see reference 5 for example)</p> <p>6- Table 1 did not mentioned in text before it.</p> <p>7- Find my attached comments on the manuscript</p>	<p>Checked</p>

## **PART 2:**

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