



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_49243
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Prostaglandins in the vasodilator effect of the aqueous extract from Artemisia annua plant in streptozotocin-induced diabetic 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>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction – Rewrite it, there is no logical sequence in the Introduction (Background, Problem statement, literature, purpose of study, hypothesis.....). Problem statement is not clear (The importance of the present study). 2. Introduction – Reduce the number of references in Introduction part (30/48 references are too high) 3. Materials and Methods – Animals were divided into three groups only. There is no standard drug has been tested. 4. How the dose was selected for the present study? 5. Results and Discussion – Poorly represented and the results were not reliable. There is no comparison between previous studies in the discussion part. 6. References – Too old. Cite few references from the recent 5 years articles. Not in uniform format. There is a difference in the format from one to another reference (Example 27, 28 and 29). 7. Moreover, all the sections in the manuscript are written poorly with a large number of grammatical and technical errors. 	<p>We thanks for your valuable comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Part1: Introduction – Rewrite it, there is no logical sequence in the Introduction (Background, Problem statement, literature, purpose of study, hypothesis.....). Problem statement is not clear (The importance of the present study). Reply: we revised the introduction. 2. Introduction – Reduce the number of references in Introduction part (30/48 references are too high) Reply: we reduced the number of references in Introduction part. 3. Materials and Methods – Animals were divided into three groups only. There is no standard drug has been tested. Reply: we thanks for your valuable comment. Our goal in the first step was to examine the effect and mechanism of action of the extract, but quantifying our results will be next goal of our study, which requires to be compared with standard drugs. 4. How the dose was selected for the present study? Reply: In our pilot study, it has been shown that this dose has been more effective 5. Results and Discussion – Poorly represented and the results were not reliable. There is no comparison between previous studies in the discussion part. Reply: we added to text. But we did not find the articles exactly the same as our study. 6. References – Too old. Cite few references from the recent 5 years articles. Not in uniform format. There is a difference in the format from one to another reference (Example 27, 28 and 29). Reply: we cited few references from the recent 5 years articles in text. Also we edited the format of references. 7. Moreover, all the sections in the manuscript are written poorly with a large number of grammatical and technical errors. Reply: we corrected grammatical and technical errors.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	