

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_129131
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the Anti-diabetic and Lipid-regulating Properties of Eclipta alba in Alloxan-induced Diabetes
Type of the Article	Research 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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I didn't find much importance of this manuscript. Because, the plant Eclipta alba was already screened for its anti-diabetic activity. The only interesting thing was, this manuscript highlighted the lipid profile changes	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Not completely. I suggest to rephrase the sentences and also to include the conclusion part	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, but the manuscript provided the limited data	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but the format for references is not unique	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO, need grammar and spelling corrections	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the figure 1, it is mentioned as M500 but nowhere in the manuscript was M500 visible. In the whole manuscript it is written as M100 which is contradicting.2. In some part of the text references were kept in Square bracket and in some part of the text it was kept in open brackets which is contradicting3. There are some errors in the text like(P<0.005-)4. In methods section, there is no complete procedure of animal treatment like route of administration and the treatment duration and blood withdrawal schedule on different days.5. In statistical analysis section, the text mentioned as Mean and SD, but the results were mentioned as Mean and SEM which is contradicting	

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:	G. Kinnera Ratna Sri
Department, University & Country	Gokaraju Rangaraju College of Pharmacy, India