

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_100997
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE HEPATOPROTECTIVE ACTIVITY OF LEAF EXTRACTS OF MIMOSA PUDICA ON WISTAR RATS
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalajrre.com/index.php/AJRRE/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript written satisfactorily.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references may be included.</p> <p>1. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract and the remaining for the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, HDL, LDL, etc.). Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated. The usage of abbreviations in the title should be avoided.</p> <p>2. The full form of the species should be given when the first time appears in both the abstract and in the remaining part of the manuscript and it should be followed by only the first letter of the genus (For example, <i>Mimosa pudica</i> when the first time appear and followed by <i>M. pudica</i>).</p> <p>3. The age group and gender of the animals should be included in the materials and methods under the heading "Animal Material".</p> <p>4. In the materials and methods, the authors may cite references for standard protocol, instead of mentioning kid or manufacture instructions, if reference is given with it and the same should be added in the reference section. In particular for toxin-induction.</p> <p>5. The authors should give the name of software with its version in the statistical analysis (material and methods) since it is not mentioned.</p> <p>6. The conclusion seems in general. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel, impact based on the strong support of the review data. Moreover, the authors may also be included the limitation of the present findings for a better understanding of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "the liver disease" may be as "liver disease"; "a histopathological" as "histopathological"; "the liver damage" as "liver damage"; "of organ" as "to organs"; ", drug-induced" as ", and drug-induced"; "use for preparation" as "used for the preparation"; "powder were" as "powder was"; "solvent were" as "solvent was"; "decanted" as "was decanted"; "40 %" as "a 40 %"; "activity proportional" as "activity is proportional"; "mode" as "and mode"; "post hoc" as "the post hoc"; "a normal" as "normal"; "an obstruction" as "Obstruction"; ", total" as ", and total"; "which is" as "which are"; "as objective" as "as its objective"; "a promising" as "promising". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the word "requiring" may be as "requires"; "liver related" as "liver-related"; "Histopathology" as "Histopathology"; "pudica," as "pudica."; "well branched" as "well-branched"; "medicine it" as "medicine, it"; "mgkg" as "mg/kg"; "formula we" as "formula, we"; "administred" as</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	"administered"; "ensure" as "ensures"; "specialty" as "speciality"; "amino transferase" as "aminotransferase"; "thibarbituric" as "thiobarbituric"; "pink colored" as "pink-colored"; "groups having" as "groups had"; "p- value" as "p-value"; "Glutathion" as "Glutathione"; "and ensure" as "and ensures"; "polyphenolic compound" as "polyphenolic compounds". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.	
Optional/General comments	The authors have put effort to evaluate the "EVALUATION OF THE HEPATOPROTECTIVE ACTIVITY OF LEAF EXTRACTS OF MIMOSA PUDICA ON WISTAR RATS". The authors describe the results undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the shortcomings which need to be considered. The paper can be accepted after MAJOR REVISIONS are carried out.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Vijaya Anand
Department, University & Country	Bharathiar University, India