

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_129175
Title of the Manuscript:	Combining aqueous extracts of Vernonia amygdalina and Tamarindus indica inhibits two digestive enzymes and improves hematological profile of streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats.
Type of the Article	Original 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>

Review Form 3

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.	Vernonia amygdalina and Tamarindus indica are use as vegetable and spice in local cuisine respectively. Therefore, if the findings of this research are translatable to human health, they could lead to improved treatment options for diabetes and its complications. The results of this study undermine the vast potential for the use of natural sources in drug discovery. Overall, the study represents a significant contribution to the scientific community by offering insights into the potential therapeutic use of natural products.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I would prefer a more suitable title "The effects of the aqueous extracts of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> and <i>Tamarindus indica</i> on digestive enzymes and hematological profile of streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats" for this research. Certain keywords in the original title "Combining aqueous extracts of Vernonia amygdalina and Tamarindus indica inhibits two digestive enzymes and improves hematological profile of streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats" suggest that; either the title was chosen after the work was carried out or the author(s) already know the effects the extracts will produce before the commencement of the work. If this is true, especially the later, it will influence the judgement of the author(s).	
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.	It is comprehensive, and no more addition.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	They are few notable issues with the manuscript, which will limit its scientific relevance if not addressed. This article failed to identify the research gap on which it stands. The article seems to be a subset of a 2023 publication with lots of concerns about its authenticity. The link to this publication is posted below.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient for the work.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a lack of consistency in the lexical and grammatical structures of the article. Say for instance, hematological and haematological were used interchangeably.	
Optional/General comments	In as much as the work offers insights to the therapeutic potentials of the plants materials used, careful analysis suggests that work was heavily copied from the link in the plagiarism section. The write up should be revisited, and readjusted. Note that it's okay to use same approach or copy someone's methods, but that should at least be rephrased or paraphrased as the case may be. This reflects the author(s) understanding of the topic. No conflicting Interest PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oloche Israel Adama
Department, University & Country	Nigeria