

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_102163
Title of the Manuscript:	An Assessment of Anti-hyperlipidemic Potentialities of Ethanolic Extract of Hemidesmus indicus in High Fat Induced Rat Modle
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the therapy studied could be used to form some clinical trials and test in dyslipidaemic individuals.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The abstract is confused. It is not clear where some section starts or finish. The conclusion is lost at the text.</p> <p>4. Just the discussion is too short.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <p>In the "Experiment" section, the authors say that the experiment lasted 10 weeks, but afterwards they report an 8-month intervention, totalling 32 weeks. After all, how long did the experiment last? This is not clear and directly interferes with the understanding of the theme presented.</p> <p>Tables presented in the results need an appropriate title, legend, and the indication of statistical difference by symbols or in bold. The presentation of the results is also very confusing, making it difficult to understand what the mean or standard deviation is, as well as which group we are talking about.</p> <p>Also, the name of the groups must be standardized. Throughout the text, the authors call the groups by numbers and in the tables, they use other acronyms, without subtitles, to identify the respective groups.</p> <p>The discussion is too short, due to the number of results, they could have better explored the findings of the present study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan José Barbosa Magalhães
Department, University & Country	Fundação Educacional do Município de Assis, Brazil