

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_98735
Title of the Manuscript:	HAEMATOLOGICAL AND HYPOLIPIDEMIC EFFECTS OF METHANOL EXTRACT OF Annona muricata (Annonaceae) SEEDS IN ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC 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://www.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript having the original research related to the diabetes and its good for the community and for society also.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. It's appropriate</p> <p>5. Not much.</p> <p>6. References is not sufficient as per the original research have, it have to increased.</p> <p>7. There is some corrections in the materials and methods so it have to correct.</p> <p>8. The words get mix with each other so correct it.</p> <p>9. Conclusion part have to correct and elevate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Not much but sufficient to understand.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Gaurav S. Mude
Department, University & Country	Datta Meghe College of Pharmacy, India