



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_50906
Title of the Manuscript:	Antidiabetic and Antioxidant Effects of the Polyherbal Drug Glucoblock and Glibenclamide in Type 2 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Minor, Lines 127-130. Can the authors state the composition versus already published ones?</p> <p>Minor, Lines 134-139: please state briefly that this is the pathological establishment of the models. Question: why the rats have not been separated in two groups (controls and stz treated) and distributed afterwards ??? The mention of groups in the Table 2 is troublesome, as groups 2 to 5 are identical.</p> <p>Minor, Discussion: I would strongly suggest cutting the discussion by a half, as the main points are rapidly covered in the beginning of the discussion.</p> <p>Minor, in conclusion, it would be interesting to fractionate the glucoblock to understand what is the element(s) giving its activity to the preparation.</p>	<p>Lines 127- 130: Phytochemical composition of the herbal capsule is stated. However, there is currently no published work or data on phytochemical composition of the herbal drug glucoblock in literature.</p> <p>Lines 134-139: Corrections effected. The establishment of the disease condition, diabetes was also highlighted in section 2.4- "Study Design and Diabetes Induction". I agree that groups 2 to 5 are identical, however, the groupings was so done according to their weight to ensure effective dosing with STZ, as not all of the rats were of same weight. Also, acclimatization with not just their environment but with themselves was considered. This is because grouping them all together, then later redistributing them in separate groups would increase infighting amongst the rats, injury and possibly death.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion was done parameter by parameter and similar parameters are discussed together</p> <p>Conclusion: I agree with this. However, the study was to check the efficacy of the whole drug as is taken by humans. Also in herbalism, "active ingredient" is not the focus, as the various phytonutrients all play vital roles synergistically or antagonistically, bringing about the overall effect in that particular disease condition.</p> <p>I appreciate every comment made. Kindly accept the article for publication.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper deals with the effects of polyherbal capsule « glucoblock » on several parameters of Type 2 diabetic rats, alone or in combination with glibenclamide. It is clearly written and makes the main points straightforwardly.</p> <p>Interestingly, the effect of the polyherbal is similar to the one obtained with glibenclamide, and the authors stressed the need for carefully use several "treatments" such as a drug and a "natural" preparation.</p>	



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>	