

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58359

Title: *Effects of Traditional Indian Antidiabetic Herbs and Their Role in Glycaemic Control: A Systematic Review*

### Recommendation:

- Accept as it is .....  
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

| Rating         | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality    |        | ✓    |      |      |
| Techn. Quality |        | ✓    |      |      |
| Clarity        | ✓      |      |      |      |
| Significance   |        | ✓    |      |      |

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

#### Strength of the study:

- The review covers several important Indian medicinal herbs used for diabetes management
- The topic is relevant to current public health concerns
- Information is supported with recent and appropriate references
- Tables improve the presentation of summarized evidence
- The manuscript explains possible mechanisms of herbal action
- The conclusion is balanced and clinically relevant
- The review highlights the need for future clinical research

#### Weakness of the study:

- The review methodology is not described in sufficient detail
- PRISMA guidelines and study selection process are missing
- Risk of bias assessment has not been included
- Ethical considerations for the review are not mentioned
- Several grammatical and formatting errors require correction
- Some statements need stronger critical analysis instead of description
- Figures and tables need better formatting and consistency

#### Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic by summarizing the potential role of traditional Indian medicinal herbs in glycaemic control. The review includes commonly used herbs and provides useful information on their pharmacological actions and therapeutic potential. The manuscript is generally well organized, and the tables make the content easier to understand. However, the review methodology requires further clarification, including details of study selection, inclusion criteria, and quality assessment of the included literature. Although ethical clearance is generally not required for a systematic review, the authors should clearly state that no human or animal subjects were directly involved. The manuscript also requires careful proofreading to improve grammar, sentence structure, and consistency in formatting and citations. A more critical discussion of the available evidence and limitations would strengthen the review. Overall, the article is informative and has publication potential after minor revisions.

#### Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original review prepared from published scientific literature, and there is no obvious indication of previous publication. However, originality should be confirmed through a standard plagiarism screening before publication. A routine similarity check is recommended to ensure compliance with publication ethics and proper citation practices.