

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_104484
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF MUSA ACUMINATA LEAVES: EVIDENCE OF PROTECTIVE OUTCOME AGAINST ALLOXAN INDUCED DIABETICS MELLITUS IN EXPERIMENTAL MODELS.
Type of the Article	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript provided evidence for the antidiabetic effect of <i>Musa acuminata</i> extract to highlight the economic significance of the plant extract. 2. Not really, a better title could be "Evaluation of the Antidiabetic Potentials of Musa Acuminata aqueous extract in Alloxan-Induced Wistar Rats". 3. Yes, but requires revision. 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. The references are not sufficient in number. Author should include the references in the indicated places in the manuscript in time and number. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	To an extent no. I recommend the author to rewrite most component of the manuscript paying attention to the language. Most sentences are not suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The author should revise the manuscript following the reviewers comments in the manuscript.	

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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Author should provide certificate or letter of ethical approval from the institutional ethical committee for the use of animals.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Augustine Madueke
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria