

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_130393
Title of the Manuscript:	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.
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 is significant as it demonstrates the potential of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> root extract in managing hyperglycemia, dyslipidemia, and platelet aggregation in type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) rats. The findings suggest that <i>A. racemosus</i> could be a promising therapeutic adjunct, and identifying its active components may lead to new treatments for diabetes complications. This research contributes to the growing field of plant-based therapies in diabetes management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article seems appropriate, but it could be refined for clarity and focus. Here's a suggestion: "Therapeutic Potential of <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> Root Extract in Managing Hyperglycemia, Dyslipidemia, and Platelet Aggregation in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus" This title more directly reflects the key outcomes of the study and specifies the focus on T2DM.	
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 generally comprehensive, but could benefit from a few modifications. It would be helpful to briefly mention the rationale behind the study, highlighting the significance of addressing hyperglycemia, dyslipidemia, and platelet aggregation in T2DM. Including a mention of the experimental methods and specific outcomes for each parameter would provide more context. Additionally, while the conclusion is strong, emphasizing the clinical relevance or next steps in research would add value. Overall, the abstract could be slightly expanded to improve clarity and detail.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it follows standard protocols for evaluating the effects of <i>A. racemosus</i> root extract on hyperglycemia, dyslipidemia, and platelet aggregation in T2DM rats. The methods used are appropriate for the study's objectives, and the results are logically presented. However, the manuscript could benefit from more detailed explanations regarding the experimental design, controls, and statistical analysis to further support the validity of the findings. Additionally, ensuring proper citation of previous research and alignment with current scientific understanding would strengthen the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided are generally sufficient and relevant, focusing on <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> and its effects on diabetes. However, many references are from earlier years (2000s and 2010s), with few recent studies. To improve the manuscript, consider adding more recent references, particularly from the last 3-5 years, to include the latest research on <i>Asparagus racemosus</i> , its bioactive compounds, and clinical studies related to diabetes management. This would enhance the manuscript's relevance and ensure it reflects current advancements in the field.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some areas where clarity and sentence structure could be improved for better readability. Certain phrases may benefit from rewording to enhance the flow and ensure precision in conveying scientific concepts. Minor grammatical or typographical errors may also be present, which should be addressed to maintain a professional standard. Overall, with some refinement, the language can meet the expectations of academic publications.	
Optional/General comments	Nil The manuscripts meets the necessary scientific standards, adheres to ethical guidelines, and is mostly well-written but may require minor revisions, such as improvements in clarity or additional references.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naila Ghafoor
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Pakistan