

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>                                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJTDH_116761</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MOMORDICA CHARANTIA AND PSIDIUM GUAJAVA ON ANTI-DIABETIC ACTIVITY</b> |
| Type of the 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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>The topic discussed is of interest to the scientific community.</p> <p>The title is appropriate to the topic covered.</p> <p>The abstract could have more information on Material and Methods, Results and Conclusions.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the article are adequate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and current.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>The English language is appropriate for the publication or for a scientific publication.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Regarding material and methods, it would be necessary to mention the population on which the study is intended.</p>  |  |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Enrique Rotemberg</b>                   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of the Republic, Uruguay</b> |