

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	SouthAsianResearchJournalofNaturalProducts
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_SARJNP_129565
TitleoftheManuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL EVALUATION AND IN-VITRO ANTIOXIDANT, ANTI-INFLAMMATORY, AND ANTI-DIABETIC ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT OF LINUM USITATISSIMUM L. SEED EXTRACT
Type of the Article	Original Research

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that a author 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.	The present study demonstrated that the flaxseed extract studied about the potential of antioxidant, anti-inflammatory and antidiabetic activity in an in-vitro model. So, further isolation, purification and in vivo studies are essential to explore its full therapeutic potential.	The study holds importance for scientific community as it provides foundational understanding of therapeutic potential of flaxseed extract in managing oxidative stress, inflammation and diabetes. So, further isolation, purification of bioactive compounds and in vivo studies are essential to explore its full therapeutic potential.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	1. Exploring the Potential Anti-Inflammatory Properties of Linum Usitatissimum L. Seed Extract 2. Evaluation of Antioxidant Activity in Linum Usitatissimum L. Seed Extract: Implications for Health	We appreciate the reviewer's thoughtful recommendations for alternative titles. Both suggested titles effectively represent key aspects of our study. However, we believe a title that integrates the antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and antidiabetic activities of Linum usitatissimum L. seed extract would better reflect the comprehensive scope of the research. For instance, "Phytochemical Evaluation and Assessment of Antioxidant, Anti-inflammatory, and Antidiabetic Activities of Linum usitatissimum L. Seed Extract" could provide a more comprehensive representation. We are open to further suggestions and will revise the title as needed to enhance its clarity and relevance
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.	Abstract gave all the information. But could be more comprehensive. Additionally, the background should be very strong why author has chosen to do this study or experiment.	Thank you for the valuable feedback. We have revised the abstract to include the specific context and relevance of flaxseed in addressing oxidative stress, inflammation, and metabolic disorders. The updated abstract also emphasizes the potential of this research for therapeutic applications, which is consistent with the study's objectives. We hope that this revision addresses the reviewer's concerns while improving abstracts clarity and comprehensiveness. We are open to further suggestions for improvement if necessary.
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	No, this manuscript needs major correction and add scientific value.	Thank you for your feedback. We have revised our manuscript and will carefully address the areas requiring major corrections to improve the scientific accuracy and value of the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, more references should be added	Thank you for highlighting the need for additional references. We have reviewed the manuscript and added recent and relevant references to strengthen the study's foundation and align it with current scientific literature. We are open to further suggestions for improvement.

[ReviewForm3](#)

Isthe language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?	Need corrections in the grammar of sentences. Need to paraphrase scientifically.	Thank you for your feedback. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and made the necessary grammatical corrections and paraphrased sentences to enhance clarity. We hope these revisions improved the overall readability of the manuscript.
---	--	---

Created by: DR

Checked by: Approved by: MBM

Version: 3 (07-07-2024)

<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments (very important corrections)</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>Page No. -2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">I suggest author should correct the font of the in-vitro in the whole manuscript. It should be in italic font.The sentence has major grammatical issues and needs correction. Here's some example of sentence—“the extract demonstrated presence of compounds phenols.....” <p>It should write as “the extract demonstrated the presence of compounds phenols.....”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The IC₅₀ values- subscript writing should be corrected. <p>Page-3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The sentence has major grammatical issues and needs correction. Here's some example of sentence..... as commented previously for the page no.2 <p>Page -4</p> <p>Line- powder was passed through mesh no.22. Finally, it was stored in air- tight container for further use..... In this line of the material method is not clearly mentioned also the storage temperature is very important for plant material which affects the plant compound activity.</p> <p>Line -2.2 extraction-300ml or 300 ml include space or without space. this is major issue to be resolved in the entire manuscript each and every line should be corrected to make an evenness of units</p> <p>Line-2.3.3 Swelling index</p> <p>“It is the volume in ml taken up by swelling of 1g of plant material under specified condition.”-make an evenness of space between numbers and unit</p> <p>How author has developed defatting procedure should include in method section which can give clear picture for the readers.</p> <p>standard of solution of gallic acid in the range of 25-500 mcg/ml. correction in space bar within sentences.....</p> <p>Major corrections are needed as scientific writing is very weak.....” The blood was centrifuged at 3000 rpm in 10 minutes and serum was discarded.”</p> <p>The blood solution was centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 10 minutes. Page No. 11—table 2 along the table content, fig 1 concentration units should be added very few references are added</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed feedback. We have carefully addressed the issues highlighted, including correcting the italicization of "in-vitro," resolving grammatical errors, standardizing the use of units, explanation of defatting procedure and spacing, and ensuring consistency throughout the manuscript</p>
--	---	---

[ReviewForm3](#)

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>	