

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79165
Title of the Manuscript:	CYNODON DACTYLON PERS.: A REVIEW ON FORAGE CROP AND MEDICINAL HERB
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>An exhaustive review with interesting findings. However few areas need some fine tuning so that the paper meets the standards.</p> <p>Abstract section.</p> <p>Since this is a review paper, it is expected that you summarise what your findings are for instance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short introduction about the review eg.AIM Of the study; This article summarizes the findings from a systematic literature review ON CYNODON DACTYLON as FORAGE CROP AND MEDICINAL HERB in several regions . Study inclusion criteria was original data collection of at least one data point about uses of this plant in herbal medicine.....Exclusion criteria should be mentioned or did you pick every paper that any any formation about the plant? 2. Your methodology should be clear eg. A total of 60 relevant articles were identified using the following databases: PubMed, PsycINFO, Communication Source, Sociological Abstracts, Business Source Elite, and the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) 3. Summarize your finding eg Most studies analyzed the use of the plant in reproductive health, immunological aspect, and some found associations between the concentration of xmg/body weight and curative index. Some studies found a lot of use of this plant in spiritual items while others associated it with supernatural occurrences. 4. Make a deliberate conclusion about your work For instance Theis overall scarcity in systematic literature and rigorous research examining the use of this plant in traditional medicine and therefore need for future studies. <p>Section 1. the introduction should be 1.0 So that the other sections below it become 1.1, 1.2,1.3 unless the journal has instructed otherwise.</p> <p>1.5. Traditional medicine in India; is the only about India? If so then the title doesn't capture that neither does the introduction indicate that as an inclusion criterion. If the review is global, then no need of such as a sub-title. Kindly let your methodology be clear so that we know what parts the review covers and what you are interested in.</p> <p>1.3. Common name and synonyms of C. dactylon This essentially should be the 1st part as a description of the plant 1.1 Then give us date on what the hit was, how was the plant described by which papers</p> <p>Data analysis</p> <p>The data you got from the review should have been analyzed. I never saw any form of analysis. The data you got from the search, is it statistically tested? What is visible is literature review</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Conclusion should give us something on the review not about the plant</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	Reference Some reference is too old and can be obsolete. You can replace it with newer citations (5yrs old) if possible	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor Revision After working on the highlighted area	
Optional/General comments	The study area is worthy research	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucy Wanja Karani
Department, University & Country	Kisii University, Kenya