

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_100494
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF ANTIDIABETIC EFFECT OF CRUDE AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF NUT, LEAF AND STEM PARTS OF <i>Vigna subterranae</i> ON STREPTOZOTOCIN-INDUCED DIABETIC RATS
Type of the Article	Full Length

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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/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> <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 findings are novel and interesting. Some of the experiments have been performed for the first time.</p> <p>The title of the paper is appropriate and describes the work done in the study.</p> <p>The abstract is very lengthy and can be cut short. Some of the sentences are repetitive.</p> <p>No the results section has been numbered 4.0, 4.1 ... which is inappropriate and should have been numbered 3.0, 3.1, etc... Conclusion is numbered 4.3 which is again incorrect.</p> <p>There are many grammatical and typographical errors throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Recent references have not been included in the Manuscript. The references are not according to the Journal style. They require thorough formatting.</p> <p>The Taxonomic names of the organisms should be written in italics even in the references which has not been done throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No, the language quality is very poor. Phrases have been joined without making a meaningful sentence.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Pictorial proof of results have not been included to validate the findings.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sharada Mallubhotla
Department, University & Country	Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, India