

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82425
Title of the Manuscript:	Invitro antioxidant, antidiabetic activities and phytotoxic profile of Alkana tinctori
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I have just reviewed the manuscript entitled "Invitro antioxidant, antidiabetic activities, and phytotoxic profile of Alkana tinctori". The topic suits well to the journal. In this manuscript, the authors investigated the antidiabetic activities and phytotoxic effects of Alkana Tinctoria, which, as shown by the authors, is promising.</p> <p><u>However, the quality of the manuscript is very poor, with several deficiencies described below:</u></p> <p>-Firstly, the manuscript contains a significant amount of grammar mistakes, including the name investigated plant ("Alkana" was used instead of "Alkanna") and the title ("Invitro" was used instead of "In-vitro")! Furthermore, the figures are unclear. For instance, what is the y-axis of both figures? In Figure 1, the legend shows a blue color that has no label. The authors did not even use subscript for H₂O₂ (H2O2). The authors repeated "Ascorbic acid was used as standard" several times, although using this sentence once in the methods section would suffice. Some other significant mistakes will have to be corrected, such as "Now e days most of peoples".</p> <p>Moreover, the presented herb is already frequently used in the treatment of skin diseases and inflammations, and, in cosmetics as a coloring agent. Despite its wide usage, the authors did not include any of these useful applications in the introduction. This is strange since from the introduction (1) it seems like this herb is not frequently used, which is not true, and (2) introducing the wide applications of this herb but presenting its another useful application would be more interesting, and appealing.</p> <p>Finally, the authors should significantly expand the discussion part, and they should discuss what specific applications their discovery can be used. What is the specific scientific contribution of their findings to the academic and industrial society? They only briefly discussed this, although this should have been discussed thoroughly.</p> <p>I suggest a careful major revision, and perhaps, rewriting the entire manuscript to improve the quality.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Baran Teoman
Department, University & Country	New Jersey Institute of Technology, United States