



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_47969
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECTS OF THE n-HEXANE FRACTIONS OF <i>Heinsia crinita</i> LEAF EXTRACT ON ELECTROLYTE BALANCE AND SOME HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC ALBINO 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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Kindly find attached the reviewed document with track changes</p> <p>My comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction failed to establish the link between hematological disorders and diabetes.</li> <li>2. The introduction failed to establish the link between electrolyte imbalance and diabetes</li> <li>3. Liver function tests would have added weight to this paper</li> <li>4. The references are inconsistent, some are written as full journal articles, some abbreviated</li> <li>5. The authors consistently do not give the exact p-value for the ANOVA tests done, instead were significant they just say p-value was equal to 0.05, which is not true, the correct exact p-values should be given otherwise the information given as is is incorrect.</li> <li>6. The way the results and discussion is written is not jellying, information about the parameters is haphazard instead of giving the results of one parameter, discuss them fully then move to the next, this should be adjusted accordingly.</li> <li>7. The names of the ethical boards that approved the study and the approval numbers should be given.</li> </ol> <p>The authors should address these</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 34 (Abstract)Do the electrolyte imbalances only result from kidney damage?</li> <li>2. Line 62 "little or no side effect" This is a common misconception, all substances are poisons, only the dose separates a poison from a remedy. It's a perceived notion that they don't have side effects.</li> <li>3. Line 125 Why did you use 180mg/dl as cut off point ,when the definition of diabetes is fasting blood glucose of 126mg/dl? Justify</li> <li>4. Line 176, 178, 188 I suggest you write the exact p-value since you have it, also include the mean and SEM, as well as the degree of freedom</li> <li>5. Fig 1 Why did you choose to use mg/dL instead of mEq/L?</li> <li>6. Line 262 Are you saying, all the p-values were = 0.05, that can not be true? write the exact p-value</li> <li>7. Line 266 Give the Mean + SEM, as well as the p-value.</li> <li>8. Line 272 What does this mean, was this significant? If yes give the p-value, mean +SEM</li> <li>9. Line 272-278 This paragraph does not have results in numbers as is needed,</li> </ol>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Point taken</p> <p>Was using P=0.05 as requested in the instructions to author. Will revert back to what was in the original which was "values were considered significant at P&lt;0.05"</p> <p>I decided to report all the results first before taking each in turn for discussions. Point is however taken. Will discuss each result before moving to the next</p> <p>Research was determined exempt from review by the University animal research or ethics review committee. This is now stated in in the Ethical approval section. <i>Thanks. Review has been very revealing and instructive.</i></p> <p>No but electrolyte imbalance is also a consequence of kidney damage. Authors will however expunge</p> <p>To be qualified with "at the therapeutic dose"</p> <p>The American Diabetes Association "Standards of Medical care in diabetes – 2014" in its framework for considering treatment goals for glycemia and dyslipidemia categorized treatment in older adults into healthy (90-130mg/dL), complex/intermediate (90-150mg/dL), very complex/ poor health (100-180mg/dL). In our Laboratory we routinely use the outer limit to assure that treatment can take care of worse scenario</p> <p>Was using P=0.05 as requested in the instructions to author. Will revert to what was in the original manuscript which was "values were considered significant at P&lt;0.05". SEM are as shown on the plots and table.</p> <p>The ADA defines FBG in mg/dL or mmol/L, which is what we routinely used and which is what you used in Query 3. Besides our Glucometer relates to values in mg/dL</p> <p>No. See Author's comment to Query 4</p> <p>See Author's comment to Query 4</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>discuss the results after mentioning them in number</p> <p>10. Line 288-302 Move discussion after each result.</p> <p>11. Line 330 How does this regeneration of kidney cells lead to restoration of insulin secretion?</p> <p>12. Line 356 With one reference, you should say earlier study</p> <p>13. 369-371 The ethics boards should be mentioned and the reference numbers included</p> <p>14. References. Abbreviation of Journal</p>	<p>See Author's comment to Query 4</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>To add "pancreatic cells" before kidney Correction taken</p> <p>Declaration re-casted to reflect fact that it was exempt from review by the University Ethics committee.</p> <p>Suggestion taken and implemented</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

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>