

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_125737
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical Studies of Averrhoa carambola Ethanol Leaf and Fruit Extracts on Alloxan-Induced Diabetic Rats.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
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.	The search for herbal based remedies for human ailments are backbone for discovery of novel compounds that can be formulated or modified to be a commercial drug	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In the the background the authors says "This study was aimed at evaluating antidiabetic properties of <i>Averrhoa carambola</i> leaf and fruit extracts on alloxan induced rats". But the title does not verify this. Even if the title is correct from study point of view it is not aligned with rational of the study	
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.	Well. So many errors in how the abstract is composed. I have attached it for the author to look at it. The author wrote restorative effect on pancreatic islet. But restorative effect can only be seen after 6 weeks of follow up. Two weeks study cannot verify restorative effect	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are appropriate. But ethical permission, acknowledgement, where study is conducted and absence of conflict of interest must be included	
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.	The idea, the protocol of the study, methods are scientifically and technically correct and sounding. Rat model, alloxan induced, grouping as control and treatment, two weeks study, crude extract preparation, standards of biochemical parameter testing are correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient and acceptable years of publications. The Author must check the correctness of Ref No 22	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is moderately correct, It seems that the author has not done sufficient editing. The editorial improvement stands out as set back. Especially the abstract part. I have partly suggested change to the conclusion part	
Optional/General comments	References are not correctly quoted in the discussion part. I have highlighted the red. Those reference must move to the end of the sentence. The missing sections mentioned above must be included The author cannot conclude the pancreatic restorative effect before 6 weeks follow up under the extract in comparison to others without extract The way blood is taken from the tail is not described well Description to the each graph and table must be written above each one of them Graphs for seed and leaf should be separately displayed	

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:	Tesfaye Tolessa
Department, University & Country	College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia