

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_122585
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Bitter Gourd (Momordica charantia) Hypoglycemic Formulation on Biochemical Parameters in Alloxan-Induced Diabetic Albino 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 aim of this research is extremely important nowadays, where the incidence of diabetes increases considerably and continuously. Furthermore, the proposed and tested option for diabetes control uses a low-cost and easy-to-obtain natural product. The extraction of the active ingredient, however, will require attention, that is, it cannot be carried out by end consumers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes and I have no suggestions.	
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.	Yes, the aim, all methods and main results are clearly explained in the Abstract. I could not find any suggestion for addition or deletion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, especially considering the Method item (i.e., accurately describes step by step all decisions taken).	
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 work has scientific validity for many reasons. As previously pointed out, all decisions made during the development of the research were clearly stated and well founded. The subject has almost immediate practical application and the conclusions show new steps to foresee new stages of research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Although some references are apparently very old, that is due to the methodological procedures used. In general the references used are important and necessary for understanding the research and comparing it with existing results in the established bibliography.	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The paper is well-founded, very well written, but, please:</p> <p>1. Materials and Methods 2.1 Plant Materials</p> <p>Choose to use "1. Introduction" or change the numbering from the method item to the conclusions item</p> <p>"Additional blood samples could be obtained by removing an extra 3-4 mm of tail (Janet Hoff, 2000)" – cite reference accurately</p> <p>"induces inflammation and generates highly reactive free radicals as by-products of mitochondrial oxidative-reduction reactions (MORR)" – or oxidation?</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 3](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Maria Lucia Pereira da Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</b>