



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_47038
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and characterization of bergapten from the root bark of Ficus exasperata (Vahl)
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	<p>Materials and methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.2; Plant material; Please indicate who identified the sample. Section 2.3; Extraction and Isolation; How did the authors ensure that the bark was completely dried after 48 h direct exposure to sunlight and another 48 h exposure to oven drying? I think the drying period of 4 days is too short. Explain. Section 2.5; Oral Glucose Tolerance Test; why were only two doses of bergapten used? No conclusion on dose-response effect could be made by using only two doses. How did the authors chose doses that were too low than the standard antidiabetic, methformin, which was used at 100 mg/kg? The major concern related to this study is that increasing the dose of bergapten from 10 to 30 mg/kg did not significantly improve the antidiabetic action of bergapten. Therefore, an additional dose of bergapten, possibly similar to methformin (100 mg/kg), is warranted to provide the exact antidiabetic profile of bergapten. Section 2.5; Oral Glucose Tolerance Test; No information about ethical application and ethical approval was provided. Which ethical approval was adopted to manage and care for the animals? <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 2; Why were the SEM value for control, 10 mg/kg bergapten and 30 mg/kg bergapten too big??? This will affect the statistical analysis. Explain what did the authors do to minimize this affect??? 	Corrections done based on the comments of the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 8; please changed to "... plant." <p>Materials and methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.3; Extraction and Isolation; Please revised the title. Extraction and Isolation of what??? Section 2.3; Extraction and Isolation; Line 42; please changed to "... and subjected ..." Section 2.5; Oral Glucose Tolerance Test; Line 68; Please edit "... Akhtar <i>et al.</i>, 2008¹⁵ ..." 	Corrected in the revised file



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>4. Section 2.5; Oral Glucose Tolerance Test; Line 71; Something is missing in the sentence "... induced with diabetes intragastric administration of glucose ...". Please revise.</p> <p>5. Section 2.5; Oral Glucose Tolerance Test; Line 71-78; Please re-write the sentences.</p>	
--	---	--

Minor REVISION comments	<p>Results</p> <p>1. Structural Determination of D-1; Line 83; Please change to "... Chunyan <i>et al.</i> (ref). ...". What is the reference number???</p> <p>2. Structural Determination of D-1; Line 85; Please change to "... 93.8-161.3 and ...".</p> <p>3. Structural Determination of D-1; Line 85; Please change to "... 6.27-8.16), and ...".</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>1. Line 122; Please change to "... bergapten ...".</p> <p>2. Line 124; Please change to "... weight ... methformin ...".</p> <p>References</p> <p>1. Some references were cited with issue provided while others were not provided with issue number. Please be constant and revise.</p>	
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The use of animals required ethical approval, but this was not provided or mentioned in the manuscript. Which animal care procedure was adopted and what was the ethics approval number?</p>	