

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_97412
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Terminalia Catappa Seed Extract on Liver Enzymes and Lipid profile of Male Wistar Rat
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://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The content of the manuscript is suitable for publication for this book. 2. This study highlights pharmacological effects of seed extract of <i>T. catappa</i> , the present study evaluated the effects of TEC on liver enzymes and lipid profile using Wistar rat models. After careful reading of the manuscript, I have found that this is very interesting work and is a good interest to international readers. The hypothesis and goal is clear with reasonable experiment design. 3. Yes 4. Discussion must be reframed 5. Yes 6. Yes 7. The experiments are well conducted, and the purpose of this study seems to be clear. But limitations of the study should include.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Grammar should be revised	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The study is well conducted	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santoshi Ram Ghodake
Department, University & Country	SMBT Dental College and Hospital, India