



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_50594
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EFFECT OF TWO ANTI-DIABETIC PLANTS: Cataranthus roseus and Nauclea latifolium ON SOME BIOCHEMICAL INDICES OF STREPTOZOTOCIN INDUCED DIABETIC ALBINO WISTAR 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Stated below are the comments in respect to the above manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract did not show any comparative effect of the extracts as indicated in the title, rather it discusses the antidiabetic potentials of the two extracts. It should be re-written to that effect.</li> <li>2. The introduction as written could be accepted, except that line 95 should be reframed. Furthermore, the aim of the study is not clearly captured in the introduction. There is use of different volumes of extracting media as seen in lines 124 and 125. This should not be if they are to be compared with one another. Equal mass should be dissolved in same volume of extracting solution.</li> <li>3. Under materials and methods, 'cure' in line 158 should be replaced with 'curing'. Also, the principle as stated in the write up does not express why STZ is used to induce diabetes in experimental rats. It either be expunged or recast to express the above. In line 162, the heading as used is hanging, such that the 'antidiabetic effect of' what is being implied? The heading in Lines 142 is the same with that in line 176. Why? They should be brought under one heading. Author(s) attention should be drawn to the layout of previous publications. The statement in line 185 'insulin was adopted as previously used' by who? It be properly cited. The apostrophe mark in line 194 should rather be replaced with a comma. Line 199 should be recast to read 'serum obtained from the clotted blood samples were kept frozen until used for biochemical analyses. The heading in line 202 should read 'data analysis' or 'statistical treatment of data' and line 204 should read 'ANOVA followed with multiple comparison with the control group according to Punnett's method'.</li> <li>4. Result: the result of the phytochemical screening should be reported in the abstract and the word 'they' should be added to line 223 to read '..... they contain.....'. Properly serialized alphabets should be used to represent the different extract treatments in the figure of line 253 and not as it is done which does not show a clear differentiation of the treatments. More so, it is critically important to know why only one result is displayed in the figure. Is it that of CR or NL? Going by the title, it is expected that the figure should contain a comparative result of both extracts.</li> <li>5. Discussion: In lines 817 and 818, 'indicated' and 'there' should be used in place of 'indicates' and 'they'. The word 'an' should be removed. Lines 821 to 826 are inconsistent in their meaning and do convey the author(s) inability to clear show if they are comparing the activity of the extracts or are merely discussing their antidiabetic, antihepatotoxic or both activities.</li> <li>6. The above is also reflected in the conclusion.</li> <li>7. The author(s) should follow the referencing pattern as acceptable with this journal.</li> </ol> <p><b>DECISION:</b></p> <p>The manuscript require major corrections and clarifications to be done on it, there after it could be accepted for publication. Furthermore, if the title is to remain as indicated, the author(s) should recast the write up to focus on comparing the activities of the extracts one with another in the presence of a control. Otherwise, the title should be reframed to read “</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	antidiabetic effect” as contained in the conclusion or “antidiabetic and antihepatotoxic effects of .....”	
<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>	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	