

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_130393
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of ethanol extract of Asparagus racemosus root on serum glucose, lipid, and platelet aggregation in neonatal streptozotocin-induced type 2 diabetic rats.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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)
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the chronic antidiabetic effects of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> root extract, particularly in reducing serum glucose, lipids, and platelet aggregation in type 2 diabetic rats. The study highlights the therapeutic potential of <i>A. racemosus</i> as a natural remedy for managing diabetes and its complications. Given the growing prevalence of diabetes and the associated limitations of conventional treatments, this work contributes significantly to exploring plant-based, cost-effective alternatives.	We thank the referee for the appreciation of our work.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Effect of ethanol extract of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> root on serum glucose, lipid, and platelet aggregation in neonatal streptozotocin-induced type 2 diabetic rats," is descriptive and adequately reflects the study's content. <i>Suggested Alternative Title:</i> "Chronic Antidiabetic Effects of Ethanol Extract of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> Root in Neonatal Streptozotocin-Induced Type 2 Diabetic Rats"	The title is revised and concluded in the manuscript. ‘Therapeutic Potential of Asparagus racemosus Root in Managing Hyperglycemia, Dyslipidemia, and Platelet Aggregation in Neonatal Streptozotocin-Induced Type 2 Diabetic Rats’
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear summary of the study's aims, methods, key findings, and conclusions. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the sample size and statistical significance of the results to enhance clarity and precision. <i>Suggested Addition:</i> Specify the number of rats used and highlight key statistical findings for glucose and lipid reduction.	With the suggestion of the referee, the abstract has been improved accordingly.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a well-designed experimental setup and robust statistical analyses. The findings are consistent with previous literature on <i>A. racemosus</i> and its phytochemicals. However, the discussion could further explore the mechanisms linking platelet aggregation reduction to diabetes management.	The correlation between platelet aggregation and hyperlipidemia has been stated in the discussion section (page 8, 3 rd paragraph)
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and relevant. However, recent studies on phytochemicals and their mechanisms in diabetes management from 2022-2023 could be included for broader context. <i>Suggested Additions:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Guo et al., 2023, for insights into functional characterizations of <i>Asparagus</i> species. <input type="checkbox"/> Recent articles on phytochemical mechanisms in type 2 diabetes from <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i> or <i>Journal of Ethnopharmacology</i> .	Recent references have been added.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is written in clear and scholarly English. Minor grammatical corrections, particularly in the introduction and discussion sections, could further improve readability.	We have checked thoroughly the grammatical errors in the introduction and discussion parts.
Optional/General comments	<div><input type="checkbox"/> The methodology is detailed and reproducible. However, providing specific doses for control treatments would improve transparency.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Include a graphical summary of the findings for better visual representation.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Address potential limitations, such as the single dose of extract and lack of comparative drug treatments.</div> <div>While it provides valuable findings, minor improvements in the discussion, references, and abstract would enhance its impact.</div>	Thank you for your appreciation. The manuscript has been revised carefully to address all your suggestions.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	During the animal study, 'Principles of laboratory animal care' (NIH publication No. 85-23, revised 1985) were followed, as well as the UK Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 and EU Directive 2010/63 EU for animal experiments. All experiments were examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee