

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_95101
Title of the Manuscript:	Musanga cecropioides attenuates chemical and diabetes induced oxidative stress in experimental animal models.
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://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, it is. This is an animal research studying the anti-oxidant effects of plant extracts. Although the work was well organized, it was written unclearly. Lot of important details are missing particularly in the Materials and Method. When the tests were performed as previously reported, only citation is not enough. Their process should be briefed and some important details such as type and trade name of used instrument, sources and grades of the used reagents, and total number of used rats (60 vs. 95) must be given. How did the extracts in various solvents were prepared? These details are needed to ensure the reliability of results. 2. Yes, it is. 3. Yes, it is. 4. Yes, they are. 5. No. As mentioned above, the Materials and Method were written unclearly. Thus the reliability of their results are in doubt. If the measurements were performed on a basic instrument such as a simple spectrometer or by using poor quality reagents, the results would be less scientifically reliable. 6. No. Some were older than 10 years. The oldest one was published in 1990. The methods used in this presentation were as cited really old or developed in the authors' country. Currently there are more accurate methods available.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes. But some improvements are needed.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Veeravan Lekskulchai
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand