

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_110918
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Analysis of Phytoconstituents, Cytotoxicity and Antidiabetic Activity of Three Regional Piper betle Varieties: First Report From Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	(1) Yes (2) Yes (3) Yes (4) Yes (5) Yes, with major revisions (6) Yes, enough	(5) The manuscript has been revised according to the reviewer's comments
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Substantial, but still need some revision	The manuscript has been revised according to the reviewer's comment
Optional/General comments	The manuscript can add new evidence to existing data on the study plant. However, it contains wrong interpretations and point of discussion. (1) Especially, the brine shrimp test is interpreted to imply anticancer activity; instead, it should be re-discussed in relation to safety concerns. (2) the study is aimed to compare a medicinal plant growing in three different place; but the discussion focused on verification, which has already been done by previous studies. Thus, it should be revised in accordance to the aim of the study. (2) the phytochemical studies are preliminary; hence, related descriptions and inferences should be within scope	The manuscript has been revised according to the reviewer's comments

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	