SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRB_48829**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of 'ZPC' Polyherbal Formulation on Diabetic-Dyslipidemic Wistar Rats**
Type of the Article	

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

	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	In this study the authors wanted to demonstrated that a polyherbal formulation- ZPC had anti- diabetic effect in Wistar rats. **Major comments** 1. The number of animals per group analyzed by the authors is a bit low. Is it possible to increase it? 2. The authors used the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Duncan post hoc test to analized the results. The authors observed two variables, the time duration of treatments and the different kind of treatment. So there are two variable. In my opinion the authors should use the two way ANOVA test. 3. In the tables it is not clear what the letters refer to. The authors should better explain the statistical significance and the meaning of CHLOR in the caption. 4. In the discussion section, the mechanism of action explained by the authors is questionable. It is not very convincing that ZPC as an antioxidant has the ability to regenerate pancreatic beta cells.In support of this hypothesis it is not possible to find the bibliographic number . 24	
Minor REVISION comments	**Minor comments** 1. The introduction section is too long. It should be shorter and more concise. 2. Line 103: *The food and water was replaced* ……were replaced….. 3. Reduce the subtitles 2.6.1.1……2.6.1.2 4. Line 195: PZC? 5. Enter the statistical significance *(p <0.05)* at the end of the sentence. 6. Always put the author's name and not the bibliographic entry in the sentence. For example, line 269: *According to Mathe, J. D., (1995)……*	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Valter Lubrano***
Department, University & Country	***Italy***