

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_97880
Title of the Manuscript:	Potentials of Pterocarpus erinaceus Aqueous Stem Bark Extract to Prevent Development of cardiomyopathy in 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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Attempt is made to correlate the effect of drug extract on cardiac markers with other related diabetic profiles and results as per the data quiet impressive but review fails to explain which possible class of constituents of the plant possessing the said activities.  Title is about 'Potentials ' but basic phytochemical screening for the aqueous extract is missing  It is comprehensive otherthan the phytochemistry  No, Sub numbering is missing like 2.4, 3.3  1. How does practically the 'Day 0' Exist ? 2. It is except not provided the authentication reference number of Plant material used  Around 60% of the references are older than 12 years	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Grammar, Punctuation, Spelling errors found	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Author Would have given preference to the Phytochemical screening of the extract	

### 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:	Ravichandra V D
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, India