

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_121947
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of Anti-hyperlipidemic Activity of Ethanolic extract of Mimosa pudica on High Fat Induced Hyperlipidemic Rat Model
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Names and abbreviations of chemicals are not as per rules of IUPAC. Scientific names of plants and all symbols or units are written in non-scientific way in whole article. All references are not on one format. Too advance (2024 or 2023) references has been mentioned in this list but their data has not been cited in the article (complete article shows that too old data has been cited actually). The data has been cited from the references before 2019. Conclude is not appropriate. Instead authors are giving a general comment on above study. All abstract is repeated and all scientific errors has been repeated in result section. Results are not presented in numerical form. All parameters which has been assessed in result section are not mentioned in materials and method section. Experimental design has been repeated here. Clearly mention Lipid profile of animal or plant has been assessed in table of results. Self-explanation of all abbreviations used in table of results as table footer is missing. In statistical analysis section, SD has been mentioned. Than why results are presented as SEM. Incomplete methodology is given. Which part and size of powdered sample is missing. Conditions , specifications, conditions of evaporation, exact pressure, temperature, place where these steps (lab, etc.), trade names or numbers or specifications of these chemicals, trial on female gender, concentrations of chemicals or drugs or plant extract, Ethical approval number is missing. Titles of tables is irrelevant to the content of the tables. Complete methodology showing which sample (blood or tissue etc.) has been collected from above animals and which parameters has been assessed and which methods has been used to assess those parameters (mentioned in result section) by using above design is entirely missing. Discussion is completely missing. Data shown as discussion is actually introduction. In discussion, clearly mention the reasons behind your results (like phytochemicals of plant used or genetics of animals on which trial has been performed) from already available most recent literature. <p>FOR DETAILED COMMENTS, SEE ATTACHED MANUSCRIPT.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suggested title is: Evaluation of Anti-hyperlipidemic and hepato-renal protective role of ethanolic extract from <i>Mimosa pudica</i> leaves on High Fat Induced Hyperlipidemic Rat Model</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>Write name of plant by using scientific method. Methodology is Insufficient. Don't use abbreviations in abstract. Only one parameters is not sufficient to support complete liver function test. There is too much repetition of similar words. Data is not sufficient to support the title. Only one parameter has been assessed while LFT and RFT data is entirely irrelevant to the title of the work.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No. See attached manuscript for complete comments.</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>This manuscript is NOT scientifically robust and technically sound as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It lack Scientific language of plant name, symbols, chemicals Personal noun is used Methodology is not complete Results are not expressed completely Repetition of data has been observed in whole manuscript. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>1. All references are not on one format. Too advance (2024 or 2023) references has been mentioned in this list but there data has not been cited in the article (complete article shows that too old data has been cited actually). The data has been cited from the references before 2019.</p> <p>Yes as too advance (2024 or 2023) references has been mentioned in this list but there data has not been cited in the article (complete article shows that too old data has been cited actually).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Asma Ahmed</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>The University of Lahore, Pakistan</p>