

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_126987
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF AQUEOUS LEAF EXTRACTS OF <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> AND SEED EXTRACT OF <i>Irvingia gabonensis</i> ON SELECTED BIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS IN ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC RATS
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study is ok, but missing more important data to be included. For example, the histological and histopathological part was missing (although in Methods the researcher mentioned to it, but no data in the results). Another matter, the researchers haven't clarified why did they use the mixture if the two different extracts at the given doses? ... if they have done previous tests or studies related to each single extract, they have to mention to it at the first place, else if they have had pilot studies to come out with the used dose, they should have included those data too. If they follow previous study recommended doses, also have to mention to that and their given reason for choosing those exact doses (not others).</p> <p>Need to re-edit and rephrase as to follow the scientific standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you have tested the effect of each separate extract add to the current results. 2. If you haven't tested the effectiveness of each separated extract, need to clarify the reason behind using these doses for the mixture. 3. If you have done histological slides for the organs mentioned (liver, kidney, pancreas) must include. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is long and comprehensive (23 words!!) The Therapeutic Effectiveness of mixture extraction of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> and <i>Irvingia gabonensis</i> on Alloxan-Induced Diabetic Rats</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is just fine.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Results Section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no results of histopathological studies (as mentioned in Methodology), 2. Tables are not well-structured, missing important info, and repeated info added for each test. 3. Conflication and confusion occur in DISCUSSION section, supporting references of previous works are enough. The CONCLUSTION need to be clearer and more informative. <p>1. If this part has done, you must include figures of kidney + liver histological sections to check on the histopathological effects. If this part is not done, you must remove the section (2.8 Histopathological Examination) under MATERIALS AND METHODS.</p> <p>2. Re-structure the Tables (as highlighted) and remove all extra-repeated info below the tables. Rephrase to the discussion section is required.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>In general, the study scope is fine. The only thing when it comes to the usage of mixture plant extract the researcher need to study the effect of each single one aside, before using the mixture to clarify which among them is more effective than others. This part was missing in the current study.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references required to support what the researchers claim in the Discussion section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good.	
Optional/General comments	The researchers need to clarify the method used for sacrifice the animal. To know if it is comply with the standards of animal ethics	

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:	Noman D. Salih
Department, University & Country	Management and Science University, Malaysia