



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_47442
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effect of Aspirin, Meloxicam and Terminalia catappa leaf extract on serum levels of some Inflammatory Markers in Alloxan induced Diabetic rats
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 the Vancouver Referencing System, the Reference List is arranged in the order that they are mentioned and NOT alphabetically. The author is strongly advised to review his referencing throughout. Reference [3] will become number first in the reference list because it is the first cited and be changed to [1] in-text.	The Authors appreciate the reviewer's comments and those corrections are made in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the ABSTRACT, under Background, it is advisable to add a statement that warrants the search for another treatment option. For example, you can mention that current treatment options are either expensive e.g. insulin or possesses unwanted side effects e.g. NSAIDs.</p> <p>In the ABSTRACT, under Materials and Methods, it is my opinion that you should mention the analytes or inflammatory biomarkers assayed during the experiment.</p> <p>In the ABSTRACT, under Conclusion, the author is advised to review your choice of words. For example, the level of reduction of these biomarkers "was much" should instead be changed to "was significant". Also, "more potent" should be changed to "potent". The same applies under CONCLUSION.</p> <p>The author is advised to provide relevant references for the assay of C reactive protein, Interleukin-6 and Fibrinogen. The leaflet provided by the manufacturer provides a good source of information, otherwise consult other journals for help.</p> <p>Under DISCUSSION, you mentioned a previous study that you reported; it is recommended to present it in your references appropriately. You don't seem to have cited it.</p> <p>The author is advised to mention the specific ethical approval. For example, Harvard University Ethical Committee on Animal experimentation</p>	These suggestions are accepted and have been corrected in the revised manuscript.
Optional/General comments	<p>In the first paragraph of the DISCUSSION, the author uses the word "stronger" to compare. The author is advised to either use the words "higher" or "increased" or "elevated" since the results are numerical in nature.</p> <p>Providing relevant references for the plant will further enrich this manuscript. Please see to it.</p>	Thanks. This is noted and it is corrected in the revised manuscript

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	