

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 10/10/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 10/16/2017
Manuscript Title:	
Combined Effect on Antioxidant Properties of <i>Gymnema sylvestre</i> and <i>Combretum micranthum</i> Leaf Extracts and the Relationship to Hypoglycaemia	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The topic covers about antioxidants of GS and CM. I found the spelling mistake of <u>Hypoglycaemia</u>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract is nicely talking about antioxidant but more discussion is required for Hypoglycemia.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes, lots of spelling mistakes.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes, but the abbreviations are not appropriate in many places. Needs to emphasize the clarity.	

<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes, it needs to be revised one more time.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The conclusions are not talking about Hypoglycemia at all.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Fine	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please talk about Hypoglycemia and how GS and CM plays a role.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Same as above.