

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_124034
Title of the Manuscript:	DIETARY MANAGEMENT OF VITEX DONIANA LEAVES IN ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC ALBINO RATS
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 current study was able to evaluate the effects of <i>Vitex doniana</i> leaves in diets and their role in nutrition. This is a commendable effort put together by the author(s). The phytochemicals analysis of <i>Vitex doniana</i> leaves was another great approach to check its pharmacological importance. If the nutritional and pharmacological constituents are properly harnessed, <i>Vitex doniana</i> leaves can serve as a better substitute for synthetic diabetes drug.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggestion: Dietary Management of Vitex Doniana (Black Plum) Leaves in Alloxan-Induced Diabetic Albino Rats	
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.	The abstract is good.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 research work is technically sound. Data presentation are clear. The conclusion drawn by the authors are on point.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient. Not all are recent. Some of the references are poorly cited.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The article is publishable. Check for any and all inconsistencies in the manuscript. If any part, figure, or table is taken from any other source, then it should be mentioned in the references.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Solomon Ojodemi Oguche
Department, University & Country	Bayero University, Nigeria