

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_129271
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL AND CYTOTOXIC EVALUATION OF THE FRUITS OF RAUWOLFIA VOMITORIA AFZEL. (APOCYNACEAE)
Type of the Article	Full length manuscript

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is interesting since it seeks to contribute to discovery of anticancer drugs/ agents. However, the author does not exactly tell why choice of this species and fruits alone. Additionally, the author(s) do not tell who and where claim the use of this plant for anticancer.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Relatively Yes. Some more comments have been included at the section for improvement	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. However, the introduction part lacks some important references to support some given statements/ definitions. The methodology part needs to be modified. The process of partitioning and preparation of the solution extracts for treatment need to be clearly stated. The document does not exactly tell what the reference standard (drug) was for comparative toxicity evaluation	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It misses current reference since several of used are more than 10 years back. The current findings need to be backed by the majority of current of within 5 years prior to this study	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It needs more improvement in the language (Several corrections and suggestion are included in the main document itself). Authors need to avoid repetitions of some words and long sentences. Scientific names should only be written in full at first mention and then the generic name is written as an uppercase initial. Similarly, solvent codes may be used to avoid the document being too worded.	
Optional/General comments	The author needs to make major corrections in the introduction and methodology part. In the discussion, the author has to convince the world of pharmacology on why it is important to invest on this plant research while there are other (several) promising plants with anticancer activity.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with the 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 detail) No	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	No	

Review Form 3

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	7

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Dr. Frank Rwegoshora
Department of Reviewer	Chemistry and Physics
University or Institution of Reviewer	College of Natural and Applied Sciences, Sokoine University of Agriculture
Country of Reviewer	Tanzania
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Researcher
Email ID of Reviewer	frwegoshora@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	+255789035505
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Phytochemistry, terpenoids, fatty acids, NMR, Bioassay, ethnopharmacology, natural products and Ellagic acid rhamnoside