Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JOCAMR_83600**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Establishment of optimal conditions to extract bioactive substances from Gamazumi using supercritical carbon dioxide**
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)

Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled "Establishment of optimal conditions to extract bioactive substances from Gamazumi using supercritical carbon dioxide" provided interesting results. Yet, the discussion of the subject is very superficial and weak. I recommend the authors to provide a little more suggestion on the importance of such a study. The discussion of the results is very simplistic. Authors should put a little more effort into this section since it is the most important from the work. Fig. 3. : a. The statement of "standard diviation" should be corrected. 4. DISCUSSION: a. The description of "Since there was no difference between the two extraction methods, it is considered that the conventional hexane extraction method may be replaced with the supercritical carbon dioxide extraction method." could be modified. Maybe "the supercritical carbon dioxide extraction method" could provide something better than "conventional hexane extraction method", so "the conventional hexane extraction method may be replaced with the supercritical carbon dioxide extraction method" was suggested. Maybe low residual solvent (hexane)…….. b. Maybe some references could be provided to support the results and discussion. d. From the results of Fig.3~5, maybe some suggestions could be provided in the "Discussion". e. The manuscript entitled "Establishment of optimal conditions to extract bioactive substances from Gamazumi using supercritical carbon dioxide". Maybe the "Establishment of optimal conditions using supercritical carbon dioxide" should be provided in "Discussion".	
Minor REVISION comments	Fig. 3. : a. The statement of "standard diviation" should be corrected. b. The statement of", * P < 0.05; Mean ± S.D = Mean values ± standard diviation of three mice." could be moved to the figure caption of Fig.3. Fig. 4. : The statement of", * P < 0.05; Mean ± S.D = Mean values ± Standard deviation of three mice." could be moved to the figure caption of Fig.4.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ching-Cheng Huang**
Department, University & Country	**Ming-Chuan University, Taiwan**