

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_95241
Title of the Manuscript:	Mapping of Potential Variation of Diabetes Amelioration Activity of Spondias mombin on Alloxan-induced Diabetic Wister Rat Concerning the Availability of Phytochemical Constituents based on Seasonal Contrast Phenomenon
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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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)	1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Ans: Yes. If Author(s) can add applications, advantages and disadvantages as separate section that would be great. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Ans: Looks good to me. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Ans: Yes. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Ans: Yes. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Ans: Yes. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form Ans: Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	I commented in the manuscript, for detail information can you refer manuscript? 1) Can Author(s) organize table in proper one word format? For example Parameter is showing in two lines. 2) Can Author(s) make all scientific names italic font? 3) What does the * mark indicate? 4) Is there a reason to change the font?	

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:	Manu Mitra
Department, University & Country	University of Bridgeport, USA