

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript Number	BHSJ 202
Manuscript Title	Hypoglycemic and Antioxidant Activity of <i>P. alliacea</i> in Diabetic Rat Models

REVIEWER'S RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Responsible for reviewing the content of manuscripts within the area of expertise.
2. Responsible in determining if a submitted article is of high quality and is of sufficient interest and impact to be accepted for a conference.
3. Responsible for ensuring keywords are attached to each article and that abstract(s) are supplied.
4. Evaluate results of the review. Based upon these reviews, accept manuscript for publication, reject manuscript, or insert suggested edits and request revision of manuscript.
5. Remain competent in areas of expertise and preserve confidentiality.

Indicate your level of acceptance by ticking (✓) the appropriate boxes with the following scales:
1: very poor, 2: poor, 3: average, 4: good, 5: very good

Evaluation Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
TITLE, ABSTRACT AND INTRODUCTION						
The title is relevant, precise and reflects the overall contents of the study.				V		
The abstract is clear and precise consist basic information, which includes the purpose, issues, methodology, and significance of the study.			V			
The abstract reflect the overall content of the study.				V		
Keywords are relevant and appropriate.				V		
The introduction section has a clear statement demonstrating that the focus of the study. The problem definition is stated clearly. There is a brief, well-articulated summary of research literature that substantiates the study.				v		
The purposes, research question(s), and /or hypotheses appropriate to the topic and area of study are related clearly.				v		
The significance of the study is described in terms of: a) Knowledge generation b) Professional application c) Positive social change				v		
Show appropriate preparation and knowledge through the background/ review of literature in the related area.				v		

Comparison/ contrast of different viewpoints/ different research outcomes is made.				v		
The content of the reviews is drawn from acceptable peer-reviewed journals or sound academic journals and the literature is reasonably recent.				v		

Evaluation Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
METHOD						
Clearly explain the research design, sampling procedure and instruments development.				v		
The process by which the data were generated, gathered, and recorded is clearly described.				v		
How the data will be analyzed is articulated. Clearly describe the software program used to analyze the data.				v		

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION						
Results are presented clearly and analyzed appropriately.				v		
The conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper.				v		
The paper identifies clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society.				v		
The findings are clear, well grounded and thought out.				v		

WRITING AND REFERENCING STYLE						
The paper clearly presents its case and is written with correct grammar, punctuation, spelling and sentence structure.			v			
Does not have over-reliance on limited sources and in-text citations are found in the reference list.				v		

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Please (✓) in the selection box

	Accepted
	Accepted with Minor Revision
v	Accepted with Major Revision
	Reject

Comment:

1. Please correct the English grammar
2. Please correct according to the review written by reviewer in the manuscript
3. "Figure" text is written in bottom of figure

Reviewer #1	Reviewer #2	Reviewer #3	Editor decision
Reject	Reject	Reject	Reject
Major	Reject	Reject	Reject
Major	Major	Reject	Reject
Major	Major	Major	Major
Major	Major	Minor	Major
Major	Minor	Minor	Minor
Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor