

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_121947</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Evaluation of Anti-hyperlipidemic Activity of Ethanolic extract of Mimosa pudica on High Fat Induced Hyperlipidemic Rat Model</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript will contribute immensely both in treatment & control of high cholesterol that is the major cause of cardiac arrest. I like manuscript for the following reasons: 1.it is well arranged; 2. it is visionary; and 3. it is scientifically based.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but the following adjustment. (An Evaluation of <i>In vivo</i> Activities of <i>Equeous</i> extracts of <i>Mimosa pudica</i> on Wistar rat). In this kind of research, it is always better to use water for extraction since it involves animal consumption.	
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.	No, it did not capture all points. It ought to be rewritten to include important points like: the nature of extract used eg, equeous, methodology, result data and conclusive statement.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, renal function test was omitted in the introduction but was reported in the result section.	
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.	I can say that this manuscript is correct on the fact that the author touched the lime lines of the field. It is robust and technically sound based on the following: 1.it is educative; 2.it will fill up some gaps medically when published; 3.it will also give room for further research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are sufficient but many are too old like; 2002 and those older than ten years should be updated to the recent journals.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	With the above corrections, the manuscript is good.	

### 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>	

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eze, Harrison Chidi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria</b>