



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_47344
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical, Radical Scavenging and Oxidative Stress Potentials of Ethyl acetate Extract of P. americana Leaf in Alloxan-Induced Hyperglycemic Rats
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>Write what <i>P.</i> Stands for in full in the title. Also do the same in the abstract. Write words in full first before abbreviating elsewhere.</p> <p>Change the title of this manuscript to “ <i>P. american leaf ethyl acetate extract phytochemical, in-vitro antioxidant and in-vivo potentials to mitigate oxidative stress in Alloxan-induced hyperglycaemic rats</i>”</p> <p>The abstract was poorly written. Include what the groups were exposure to, in-vitro studies were not done on the albino rats. Fix it. The results were not properly presented in the abstract section.</p> <p>Remove the words highlighted in red in the introduction</p> <p>What is the source of the glucophage and alloxan used for the study?</p> <p>What known amount?</p> <p>Next time acclimatize for a week to 2 weeks. 3 days is rather small. What is the relative humidity and temperature of the place the rats were kept?</p> <p>What is EPAL, write in full</p> <p>The concentrations given to the rats was it related to their body weight? If so include it to the study.</p> <p>Present 2.3 to 2.4.6 first before 2.2 and 2.2.1</p> <p>The methodology does not have glutathione reductase and glutathione peroxidase.</p> <p>Present the results first before the discussion</p> <p>There was no declaration of the statistical approach adopted in the materials and methods section. Note, unlike what you have in the abstract, mean \pm SD is to be determined first considering that you reported your data in that form before the ANOVA at $P=.05$.</p> <p>Express $P=.05$ in all place. This is what the journal wants and not $P<0.05$.</p> <p>What concentrations were tested for the <i>in-vitro</i> studies to have determined the IC_{50}. They were not indicated in the methodology. Hence it has affected the results presentations. Resolve it in both table 1 and 2. Perhaps, how many replicate did you perform for the in-vitro antioxidant studies? It did not reflect in the study.</p> <p>Recheck the result in table 1, is phenolic not significantly different from tannins, saponins, flavonoids and alkaloids. Express the significance properly. Please do the same in the other tables. Express the significant differences properly. It is important, they were not done properly.</p> <p>The references are not consistent and should be in accordance with SDI authors'</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Yes in-vitro studies were not conducted on the rats only on the extract.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Reference given</p> <p>The amount has been stated.</p> <p>Noted, the temperature and humidity are all written.</p> <p>EPAL----- Ethyl acetate extract of <i>Persea americana</i></p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>It was done in triplicate</p> <p>Done</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	guideline.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Attain to the above and check for grammatical syntax.	Noted

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>	No ethical issue of any kind was involved in this study.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>