

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_90727
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIHYPERLIPIDEMIC STUDIES OF METHANOLIC EXTRACT OF GOSSYPIUM HERBACEUM: AN IN SILICO AND IN VIVO APPROACH
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.journalajrimps.com/index.php/AJRIMPS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: you should mention your background of research before the aim of study. And the last sentence of result in the abstract is not clear. What do you want to report? 2. Introduction: the sentences "Propyl thiouracil and Triton X 100 are used in induction of hyperlipidaemia and Atorvastatin and ascorbic acid serves as standard in our present study." should be in the Material and Methods. 3. Introduction: the last paragraph need citation. 4. Material and Methods: what is the OECD guideline? It is not a common guideline so you must give some details. 5. Material and Methods: how many were rats used in Acute toxicity testing? 6. Material and Methods: how many were total rats used in your study? Why did you use 2 models for inducing hyperlipidemia? Were the rats in these 2 groups the same ones? 7. Material and Methods: How did you get rats' blood for serum total cholesterol in propylthiouracil induced hyperlipidemia study? And duration time between inducing hyperlipidemia and blood drawing in this model was 6 hours, was not it? Why was not 7 dasy as the other model? 8. How much was blood volume collected from retro orbital sinus puncture? Was it enough for all tests? 9. What methods and instruments did you used to analyse blood lipids? 10 How did you do the in vitro antioxidant assay? Did you study in a test tube? Any cell lines were used? 11 Overall, this manuscript should be re-written concisely and comprehensively. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Veeravan Lekskulchai
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand