SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_46818**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Anti-hyperglycaemic and Mode of Action of Thaumatococcus danielli (BENN.) BENTH Ethanol Leave Extract in Streptozotocin-Induced Diabetic Rats**
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)

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	**General Comments:** The manuscript identifies the anti-hyperglycemic effect of ethanolic extract of *Thaumatococcus danielli* leaves. The authors have gone further to identify the mechanisms that mediate this effect. Their results suggest 3 major mechanisms of action including the inhibition of pancreatic α-amylase activity, enhancement of peripheral tissue glucose uptake and inhibition of haemoglobin glycation. This is an excellent study that can be given priority for publication. The manuscript however requires some editorial changes in a few places for rectifying grammatical errors and to improve the readability before it can be published. **Specific comments:** In table 1: Percentage decreases in fasting blood glucose (DFBG) is misleading as the values for diabetic control goes to negative value due to the conversion of % decrease to the absolute increase in values. Instead the authors can express the results as percentage increase in fasting blood glucose (% increase) that will give the positive value for the absolute increase in glucose levels in diabetic control group that will enable readers to easily understand the effects of the test drugs. In table 2: In testing the concentration response for alpha-amylase inhibitory activity, the authors have went with concentrations up to 750 micrograms per ml. However, the effects does not seem to have saturated even at the highest dose of 750 micrograms/ml that did show a further increase of about 4.5 % from the 500 micrograms/ml dose necessitating to check one more higher dose, i.e., the next dose of 1 mg/ml to complete the assay. It is possible that the effect may get saturated at this dose. However, this dose needs to be included in order to confirm the IC50. Other than these two minor points, I do not have any concerns and the manuscript can be published after the inclusion of these data.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Muruganandan Shanmugam***
Department, University & Country	***Wayne State University, USA***