



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_48030</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Neuroprotective effect of different doses of VitamineD3 in diabetic-induced Alzheimer rat model.</b>
Type of the Article	<b><u>Original Research Article</u></b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	I think that authors should answer to the following questions: Which was the value of HbA1c in each group? What was the type of treatment given to animals? If insulin treatment was then they should report the dose of insulin for each group.	We thank the reviewer for these valuable comments. 1- In the current study, we measured the FBG of each rat every two weeks because FBS sounds more reliable to separate diabetic from non-diabetic rats than HbA1c. We measured the FBG just to ensure the <b>stability of a diabetes rat model</b> because we are just focused on the effect of vitamineD3 on cognitive dysfunction resulted from chronic diabetes. 2- 3- With regards to the treatment we used, our study concentrated on the neuroprotective effect of vitamineD3 on cognitive dysfunction resulted from <b>untreated diabetic</b> , so there is no need to treat of diabetes by insulin or other anti-diabetic medications.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	I think that, the methodology is appropriate. The manuscript is generally clearly written and the discussion / conclusions are acceptable.  Overall, the data are not of interest	We are grateful to the reviewer for these kind comments, and we disagree with the last sentence of comments. We do believe that our results may draw attention to the significance of vitamin D3 administration in diabetic patients and guide physicians to correct vitamin D level before initiating anti-AD treatments.

**PART 2:**



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>  NO	