

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_121944</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Evaluation of Anti-hyperlipidemic Activity of Ethanolic Extract of Asparagus racemosus on High Fat Induced Hyper-lipidemic Rat Model</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### Review Form 3

S

#### 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>I appreciate that the focus of this manuscript linked traditional knowledge with its scientific evaluation in contemporary times. The rationale using a well-established animal model for the efficacy testing of the ethanolic extract seems quite sound and could be useful in substantiating therapeutic claims on <i>Asparagus racemosus</i>. The findings can open up future directions for clinical trials and further research into the medicinal properties of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i>.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>As mentioned in <b>Materials and Method</b> section that the author(s) used the leaves of plant for extract preparation, so that the medicinal part of plant should be mentioned in title, which shows more targeted approach. In addition, instead of "High Fat Induced", "High Fat Diet Induced" shows more clear insight about the research, hence; the alternate title should be:</p> <p><b>"An Evaluation of Anti-hyperlipidemic Activity of Ethanolic Extract of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> Leaves on High Fat Diet Induced Hyper-lipidemic Rat Model"</b></p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>"Anti-Hyperlipidemic Activity of Ethanolic Extract of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> Leaves in a High-Fat Diet-Induced Hyperlipidemic Rat Model"</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is very clear, concise and to the point. Considering the word limit, I suggest to add conclusion of research in 1-2 sentences at the end of the abstract.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, sub-sections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. I suggest including Toxicological study of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> leaves extract in the methodology and result section if researcher(s) performed it in-person. If not, the safety profile of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> leaves extract should be discussed in <b>Introduction</b> section.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The authors of manuscript followed a well-structured experimental design and appropriate methodology. The use of a high-fat diet-induced hyperlipidemic rat model is a widely accepted approach to mimic human hyperlipidemia, allowing for a relevant assessment of the anti-hyperlipidemic effects of the ethanolic extract of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> leaves. Furthermore, the manuscript employs standard biochemical assays to evaluate lipid profile parameters, ensuring accurate and reliable data collection. The inclusion of a positive control i.e. Atorvastatin further strengthens the study by providing a comparative analysis, thereby validating the efficacy of the <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> leaves extract.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes, there are total 35 references, which are sufficient. The oldest reference is of 2005 and another of a book, published in 1997, which is acceptable because these are essential for understanding the background.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Please recheck the Introduction Section where the reference number 10 is given, there is some typing mistake.</li><li>2. The plant name (<i>Asparagus racemosus</i>) is not italic at various places.</li><li>3. The authenticity letter of The National Herbarium of Bangladesh should be attached OR the picture of plant specimen should be attached for authentication.</li><li>4. The strain of Rats is not mentioned anywhere in the manuscript. Please provide the name of Strain of Rats used.</li><li>5. The group 3 of table 1 (in material and method section) is showing induction of Atrovastatin whereas group 3 of table 3 is showing induction of Rovast (Rosuvastatin). As both drugs are different, I suggest revising here and author should provide proper information about positive control drug (abbreviation of that particular groups also needs revising).</li><li>6. The “<b>Experimental Animal Procurement, Nursing, and Grouping</b>” section shows 90 rats were randomly assigned to 9 groups, with each group including <b>10 rats</b>, whereas author claimed under “<b>Experimental design</b>” section that the rats were split into nine separate groups and each group had <b>five</b> rats. Furthermore, under “<b>Evaluation of anti-hyperlipidemic Activity</b>” after <b>Table 3</b> author wrote that, <b>For this experiment, 100 rats were randomly picked and equally divided into fourteen groups.</b> These all are very misleading statements and needs serious revising.</li></ol>	

### PART 2:

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Anas Shamsi
Department, University & Country	Hamdard University, Pakistan