



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_47201
Title of the Manuscript:	SOME EFFECT OF CRUDE EXTRACT OF NEEM BARK ON THE PANCREAS OF STREPTOZOTOCIN INDUCED DIABETES OF ADULT WISTAR RATS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction needs more bibliographic cites Why two different types of cites? Why a presentation of pancreas? Is really needed? "Medicinal Properties" – And all of this that has been said previously? More than 2 pages!</p> <p>Also, the introduction continues with diabetes mellitus that has been explained previously. All this should be reduced and systematized.</p> <p>All photographs are x100?</p> <p>GSH and MDA "This suggests the effectiveness of the aqueous low dose of the neem bark extract rather than the aqueous high dose of the extract in the enhancement of this enzyme." Why happens it? Propose some mechanism</p> <p>Recommendation is too large and I think not supported by the article, it should be more objective and recommend treatment without dosification established is a risk</p>	<p>All corrections have been done as per comments</p> <p>Correction done</p> <p>Done Done Done Done</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>English revision is needed</p> <p>Interesting information, complete but bad organized. The article could be improved, results sounds interesting but authors should be more critical.</p>	<p>English edited and corrected</p>

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