



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47971
Title of the Manuscript:	Accessing the Hypoglycemic effects of Seed Extract from Celery (<i>Apium Graveolens</i>) in Alloxan-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	<p>Be both concise and precise in the area highlighted in red in the abstract. Remove the unnecessary information in the abstract. It is bulky. What are the weight ranges? Take the ESR report to the haematology area. Remove the PVC report highlighted in red. Make the abstract lucid, and unambiguous.</p> <p>The reference style in the body of the work is not in line with SDI author's guideline. Burke JP, et al., 2003, Therefore B, 1990</p> <p>Write in full first: OH and DPPH, CBC,</p> <p>What is the temperature and the humidity of the area they were kept? And the nature of the cage used?</p> <p>In 2.4, at what frequency did they received the alloxan "Group III - Untreated diabetic rats that received two doses of alloxan 150mg/kg". Where is the reference for this "These experiments complied with the guidelines of our animal ethics committee, which was established in accordance with the internationally accepted principles for laboratory animal use and care".</p> <p>Did you use chloroform or ether anaesthesia, which one?</p> <p>2.6 is poorly cited. You may have used kit for this analysis however there are reference methods for each of the analysis in the kit. They are to be provided. Some may not have the same kit in the places however they may have access to the test method. This is needed for reproducibility sake. Fix them.</p> <p>What is the rationale for choosing 415mg/kg of the extract?</p> <p>Bring up the results to the results section. Place each of the table or figure to where the results were interpreted.</p> <p>What does the * and ** in the table implies? Write the implication just below each of the table. Try to also include the number of replication for which the results you reported.</p> <p>Nothing was said about table 2 in the materials and method.</p> <p>Do well to identify what Ds means.</p> <p>In Tables 5,6 and 7, be specific about which is positive or negative control. So far, you have been reporting group 1 and 2 to be both control groups. Without this identification it will be difficult to verify the said statistical difference by ANOVA.</p> <p>If * means significant difference what about **? The references are not consistent. See the SDI authors' guideline to fix the references properly.</p>	<p>The reference style has been corrected</p> <p>Full form written</p> <p>All the corrections have been done according to reviewer's comments.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Attend the above raised issues and fix a few grammatical errors.	

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)	

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>