SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_47021**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUTION OF ANTI-DIABETIC POTENTIAL OF AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF LUFFA CYLINDRICA (NATIVE SPONGE/SPONGE GOURD) LEAF AND SEED ON ALLOXAN INDUCED DIABETIC 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Stojanoski n. Development of health culture in veles and its region from the past to the end of the 20th century. Veles: society of science and art. 1999:13–34. – This cite do not support the statement. 2. "possibility of transforming the chemical agents implicated in the plant of study into synthetic drugs to combat endemic diseases such as cancer and HIV should be the next focus of the clinical scientists." – Please cite 3. "Flavonoids found in Luffa cylindrica plant which is shown to have been present in both extracts acts to deteriorate high glucose level in diabetic rats by directly stimulating the pancreatic secretion of insulin from β-cells" – How could be it concluded based on the study realized? 4. Extended phytochemical composition of L. cylindrical is needed to better understand the MS	Further work is on-going to better understand the manuscript and correction have been made.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It sounds relevant and results are interesting.	

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)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link:
http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20