



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_47917
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of in vivo Synergistic Hypoglycemic & Hypolipidemic Activity of Ethanolic Extract of Calotropis gigantean Leaves in Combination to Metformin in Alloxan Induced 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction is poor. Kindly REWRITE the introduction to improve the readability of the manuscript. Verify, harmonize and structure the introduction to achieve what an introduction does to an article.</li> <li>2. What are the following: ICDDR, DMSO, FBGL, SPSS? Write in full.</li> <li>3. What is the unit for the FBGL for the days of treatment?</li> <li>4. Establish the rational for a 7 days experimental research. Justify the study model.</li> <li>5. Why subject the analysis to <math>P=0.05</math>, <math>=0.01</math> and <math>=0.001</math>? Are you trying to establish a significance difference which should not be done in experiment like the present one? Perhaps, what are the values express below some of the values in bracket in the table? Attend the issues above for each of the table.</li> <li>6. Choose between figure 1 and table 1 for the presentation of the result. You can not present both. Do same for table 2 and 3, figure 2 and 3.</li> <li>7. What is the rational for placing organ weight in table 2? You cannot place it there.</li> <li>8. How possible is it for TC to be higher than TG?</li> <li>9. And even the HDL-C is now higher than TC and TG. This is unacceptable. I totally disagree with such result.</li> <li>10. Why the emphasis on liver weight?</li> <li>11. There are lots of grammatical errors. Read through and correct them.</li> </ol>	<p>1. Introduction contains the related information of research study as well as the rationale of study.</p> <p>2. Corrected</p> <p>3. Corrected</p> <p>4. Justified with reference in Collection of blood and determination of Biochemical Parameters section.</p> <p>5. Significance level (<math>P&lt;0.05</math>; <math>**P&lt;0.01</math>, <math>***P&lt;0.001</math>) among different groups at significance level <math>P\leq 0.05</math> were determined.</p> <p>Diabetic rats were compared with normal rats. For ex. <math>9.05-8.02=1.03/8.02=0.1284=12.84\%</math></p> <p>Metformin and <i>C.gigantea</i> treated diabetic rats were compared with diabetic rats. For ex. <math>9.6-6.07=3.53/9.6=0.3677=36.77\%</math></p> <p>6. Corrected</p> <p>7. Corrected</p> <p>8 &amp; 9. Hyperlipidemia associated with diabetes mellitus is reduced by limited absorption of free fatty acids and free cholesterol following inhibition of pancreatic lipase and pancreatic cholesterol esterase. The plant extract shows the reduction of triglyceride (TG) and total cholesterol (TC) as well as elevation of plasma HDL-cholesterol (good cholesterol) that prevent risk of developing cardiovascular disease. So HDL-C should be high</p> <p>Cholesterol is mainly affected by the amount of total fat consumed Triglycerides are a form of stored fat in the blood.</p> <p>Normal range (TG): Less than 1.7 millimoles per liter (mmol/L)</p> <p>Normal range (TC): Less than 5 millimoles per liter (mmol/L)</p> <p>So TC can be higher than TG.</p> <p>10. It could be ascribed to increased triglyceride accumulation that can lead to</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b>12. The statement “Sequential injection of alloxan caused a significant increase (p&lt;0.05) in blood glucose concentration for 7 days in all group of rats compared with their respective baseline blood glucose and to control values” is not true. Verify the P- values.</b></p> <p><b>13. The discussion is not lucid, it is ambiguous and vague. The author needs to organize the section. Meanwhile the highlighted areas in red are to be verified and presented in better form.</b></p> <p><b>14. The conclusion should also be improved.</b></p> <p><b>15. The references are not consistent. See the authors’ guideline to effect the correction.</b></p> <p><b>16. There are lots of grammatical error and shoyld be fixed.</b></p>	<p>liver enlargement by reason of increased entry of fatty acids into the liver induced by hypoinsulinemia. So liver weight can predict the effect of diabetes on rat.</p> <p>11. Corrected 12. Corrected 13. Corrected 14. Corrected 15. Corrected 16. Corrected</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>	Antidiabetic & hypoglycemic test were sarried out on rat model in strict compliance with the National Research council guidelines on the care and use of laboratory animals to minimize research animal pain and suffering