

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_117079
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-HYPERGLYCEMIC EFFECTS AND HISTOLOGICAL CHANGES IN STREPTOZOTOCIN-INDUCED DIABETIC RATS FED WITH HIGH CONCENTRATION OF COLOCASIA ESCULENTA FLOUR.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community but there are several inconsistencies and biases. There are inconsistencies in the number of the rats in total and per groups in the MATERIAL AND METHODS SECTION. Researchers may sometimes opt for larger sample sizes to ensure the robustness and reliability of their findings. What was the difference between groups A and B? There is no clear details of both treatments, it appears to be the same. What is the meaning of "high dose of Colocasia esculentum flour"? Why there are no different doses and why there are no ANOVA or Tukey results (despite being mentioned in the manuscript)?</p> <p>2. The abstract has several Acronyms which confuses and are not explicitly explained. It mentions STREPTOZOTOCIN as an diabetes mellitus inducer, but why is it not explained in detail in the rat group description in the MATERIAL AND METHODS SECTION?</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, the references would be sufficient and recent. Especially the highly related ones that could be more efficiently used in the discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the English is overall correct, but there are few suggestions in the manuscript to improve it.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julio Alfonso Chia Wong
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Agraria de la Selva, Perú