

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_103115
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-hyperglycemic effect of the aqueous extract of Carapa procera on rats submitted to a high-calorie diet
Type of the 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
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>6. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>7. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This study provides data that can be used in the field of pharmaceuticals and medicine. The title of the paper is consistent with the assumed objectives.</p> <p>The abstract is formulated according to the objectives of the research.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is properly constructed, covering the steps taken in defining the research and interpreting the results.</p> <p>The way of organizing the study, the presentation of the methods and conditions in which the research was carried out, the bibliographic references studied as well as the way of interpreting the results are elements that would substantiate the research carried out.</p> <p>The references studied and used in the presentation are appropriate</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General comments</b></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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tita Ovidiu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, Romania</b>