

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_82954
Title of the Manuscript:	The mixture aqueous extracts from Oxalis corniculata L. and Acmella caulirhiza Delile accelerates bone healing in fractured rats.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for asking my opinion about the manuscript entitled "The mixture aqueous extracts from Oxalis corniculata L. and Acmella caulirhiza Delile accelerates bone healing in fractured rats.". I believe that this manuscript should be major revision: r</p> <p>There were several good things about the paper, such as aim good. But the abstract should be reformulated and the objective of the study should be well highlighted.</p> <p>1. The abstract should be completely changed. The abstract is untidy and needs to be paraphrased. Keywords are at least five words.</p> <p>2. The introduction is very short?</p> <p>2.1. In the introduction, include the significance of the study as well as novelty. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge?</p> <p>2.1. In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explained why this study was conducted.</p> <p>3. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased.</p> <p>4. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed.</p> <p>viewer's comment</p> <p>Is it possible to cite references from my papers in the research that I have reviewed?</p>	<p>The authors thank the reviewer for you for all the remarks</p> <p>1. The abstract and keywords have been improved.</p> <p>2. Introduction</p> <p>2.1The introduction has been revised</p> <p>This study was aimed at providing laboratory validation of the claim of bone regenerative action of plants mixture made in the Cameroonian ethnotraditional practice.</p> <p>Techniques mentionned in this article are currently used to show bone regeneration. However, in the present work, two routes of administration are used at the same time (percutaneous and oral routes) allowing a rapid bone repair. In addition a mixture of plants is administered in different proportions according to the healer's instructions.</p> <p>3. The authors thank the reviewer for the suggestion. Some references have been added. Please see "references section".</p> <p>4. We are thankful to the reviewer for the observation. Grammatical errors have been checked and highlighted throughout the manuscript.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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