

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_98731
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIOXIDANT PROPERTY OF METHANOL CRUDE EXTRACT OF UNRIPE PULP OF <i>Carica papaya</i> ON ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC MALE ALBINO RATS
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://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes ANTIOXIDANT PROPERTY OF METHANOL CRUDE EXTRACT OF UNRIPE PULP OF <i>Carica papaya</i> IN ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC MALE ALBINO RATS Yes Yes Yes Fine but formatting required. Uniformity is to be established.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs to be revised for grammar. First time mention needs full form of abbreviations like DNA, CAT, SOD etc. MDA has been termed as MAD at multiple places.	
Optional/General comments	There is repetition of GPx estimation in methodology. Why glucose was not estimated on autoanalyzer? Was the analysis done the same day? If not, how were the samples stored? . Weekly comparison of glucose levels is not done as mentioned in methodology. Was approval obtained from Institutional animal ethical committee? If yes, please mention the number of the letter. Robust statistical analysis is required to comment on the most effective dose. Was there no significant change in MDA conc in different groups? If not, the justification needs to be discussed. Other aspects of results should also be discussed in detail.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kiran Dahiya
Department, University & Country	Pt. BD Sharma UHS, India