

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77496
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Medicinal Plant: Terminalia arjuna(Roxb.)
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The title is misleading because it doesn't specify the aspects on which the review article will be based!</li><li>- The methodology used to prepare your review article is missing</li><li>- Since the previous review articles on the same topic, no new findings have been reported to explain the publication of the present manuscript as a review</li><li>- What is the added value of that manuscript for the scientific community? It is not a problem of novelty but it means that other researchers published practically on the same topic and they are more critical. May be you can do more critical analysis of the literature data.</li><li>- The definition of the objective of this article was based on ref. 6 and 7 which are from the years 2015 and 1990, probably also considered in the review articles that preceded yours on the same topic . Comparing the contents of the following review articles ( mainly the first):<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Amalraj, A. and S. Gopi, 2017. Medicinal properties of Terminalia arjuna (Roxb.) Wight &amp; Arn.: A review. J. Tradit. Complement. Med., 7: 65-78.</li><li>2. Khaliq, F. and M. Fahim, 2018. Role of Terminalia arjuna in improving cardiovascular functions: A review. Indian J. Physiol. Pharmacol., 62: 8-19</li><li>3. Neelam Soni and Vinay Kumar Singh, 2019. Efficacy and advancement of Terminalia arjuna in Indian herbal drug research: A Review. Trends Applied Sci. Res., 14: 233-242.</li><li>4. Gaikwad D, Jadhav N, 2018. A review on biogenetic properties of stem bark of Terminalia arjuna: A update. Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 11(8): 35</li></ol></li></ul> <p>and yours, the conclusion will be that they are more critical and complete, that there is no reason to publish your manuscript as it is, as a review article.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- This manuscript should be considered a summary of summaries! Because as a review, the expectation was to see more comparisons, critical analysis, etc. and not a simple presentation of results reported in the literature, considering the fact that there are more review articles on the same topic!</li></ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>To do linguistic revision in some paragraphs To correct small mistakes in the text and table 2.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>François Munyemana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique</b>