

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_121949
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of Anti-hyperlipidemic Activity of Ethanolic extract of Terminalia arjuna on High Fat Induced Hyperlipidemic Rat Model
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### 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.	I dislike this manuscript due to its inconsistencies in experimental design, inadequate methodological details, and numerous grammatical errors. These issues undermine the reliability and clarity of the study, making it less impactful for the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not fully aligned with the purpose stated in the introduction, which focuses on hepatoprotective effects. A more suitable title could be: "Hepatoprotective and Anti-Hyperlipidemic Effects of Ethanolic Extract of Terminalia arjuna in a High-Fat-Induced Hyperlipidemic Rat Model." This title better reflects the dual focus 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.	The abstract lacks clarity and fails to provide a concise summary of the study. It should clearly state the objective, methods, primary results, and conclusion to enhance readability and understanding.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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 plant extraction method lacks crucial details, such as the solvent-to-material ratio, which is essential for reproducibility. The manuscript also omits authentication details of the plant material, including the authentication number and the taxonomist's name. Additionally, the IAEC approval number is missing, which is necessary for ethical validation. There are several grammatical errors and inconsistencies in the experimental design, such as discrepancies in the number of rats and animal grouping (90 vs 100; 9 vs 14). The manuscript mentions the procurement of atorvastatin, but throughout the study, rosuvastatin is used. This inconsistency should be addressed to avoid confusion. The methods for measuring lipid profiles, liver function tests, and kidney function tests are not described in sufficient detail. The specific kits or techniques used must be mentioned to ensure reproducibility. There is inconsistency in the abbreviation of groups between the methodology and results sections. Ensure that the abbreviations are consistent throughout the manuscript. The statistical analysis is inadequately detailed, lacking information on post-hoc tests. The discussion needs to be more thorough, with better integration of statistical analysis and literature, and the conclusion should more clearly summarize the findings and future research directions, specifically targeting the gaps identified in the current study.	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Some of the references are outdated, and there is a lack of recent studies that could provide a more current context for the research.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript, in its current state, lacks the necessary clarity, rigor, and detail required for publication. The study's significance is overshadowed by poor organization and insufficient methodological detail. Major revisions are required to improve the overall quality of the manuscript before resubmission.	

### **PART 2:**

	<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)
<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>Zeenath Banu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>RBVRR Women's College of Pharmacy, India</b>