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Major Compulsory Revisions:
How Stellaria media. inhibiting pancreatic amylase and lipase activity. mechanism of action and the active principle responsible for that action

Methods:
- How many mice per cage need to be added?
Also the initial and final body weight of each group
- Symbol of * can not mark between the 3 groups by ANOVA

Results:
The author reported that, The phsico-chemical parameters viz; ash values, loss on drying, hemolytic activity; heavy metal analysis (Lead, Cadmium, Arsenic), microbial (E.coli, Salmonella Sp., S.aureus) and aflatoxin (B1 + B2 + G1 + G2) contamination were determined.

But this data not presented in table or figure in the result section.

- The author depends on measuring plasma TG as indirect evidence of the lipase activity.
Whey the activity itself not measure as it is the mean cause of Stellaria media action as antiobesity as the author's hypothesis. It is critical.

- Blood glucose level should be done to support or not the activity of pancreatic amylase. Also pancreatic amylase activity inhibited by LJ invitro which may be different from invivo study and the author depend in this activity to evaluate its antiobesity in vivo.so the evident for the effect of LJ become faint and need more support.

- Concerning comparison between HFD group and normal animal control negative mice there were non significant changes in the food intake (Table 1) how the body weight increase and get the obesity condition.

- Markers of obesity seem not enough to document the obesity state.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Not well described concerning the obesity parameter and evidence.

3. Are the data sound?
The data of the experiment is routine work in the part of obesity and may be good quality in the phytomedicine part.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Fair

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion not adequately supported by the data in the part of obesity and the mechanism of LJ action.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Not stated

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
The author deal with Pharmaceutical Sciences, and not acknowl. Nutrition or obesity work.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
To certain extent but in the part of obesity need more clarification

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Ok

- Markers of obesity seem not enough to document the obesity state and need to be clarify
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