

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_101445
Title of the Manuscript:	In vivo Evaluation of Anti-diabetic activity of Aqueous and Methanolic Extracts of C .tinctorius L. (Safflower Florets)
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.journalapri.com/index.php/APRJ/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. Topic of manuscript is interesting, and important but manuscript should be adapted. 2. The study is performed on experimental animals, according to that it is not in vivo study, as it states in the title, so it should be modified. 3. Yes 4. Discussion should be emphasised and adapted, and formation of graphs and tables in necessary. 5. Yes 6. Reference list include only 8 references, it should be extended. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Manuscript should be reevaluated; graphs and tables should be formatted. Reference list should be extended, and discussion is need to provide more evidence in comparison to other research.	

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:	Nataša Pejčić
Department, University & Country	School of Dental Medicine, University of Belgrade, Serbia