



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_14855
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Structural Elucidation of the Most Active Antidiabetic Fraction of Corchorus Olitorius Seed Extract
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	In this study the authors investigated antidiabetic properties of ethanolic seed extract of Corchorus olitorius (ewedu). In that course, they isolated three pure fractions (C1, C2, C3) from this extract, potentially responsible for its antidiabetic effect, and performed structural analysis of the most active antidiabetic fraction (C2). The antidiabetic effects of the three isolates were tested in alloxan (150mg/kg body weight) induced diabetic albino rats (rat strain not indicated). Glibenclamide (0.2mg/kg) was used as positive control. This study is interesting given that plant extracts having hypoglycemic effects are increasingly used in diabetes treatment. However, though Introduction and Discussion sections are correct, Results section is extremely poorly written. Therefore, the paper is not acceptable for publication in its present form, but should be considered for publication in Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences after major changes, if the authors could address comments listed below.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. The sentence: <i>"The pure compounds were pooled according to likes following each cc as in table 1. And also shown in figure 2, 3 and 4 are TLC confirming the pure compounds C1, C2 and C3."</i> is not clear. Please explain your results more precisely. The same comment is for the rest of the Results section. There is not clear presentation of the results, just enumeration. 2. What is Figure 1? It should be deleted. The authors should have in mind that this is scientific paper. 3. Figures 2, 3 and 4 should be presented as one Figure with a), b) and c), there is no need to have 3 separate figures. Even more, this figures could be deleted. 4. Figures 13 and 14 should be presented as one Figure with a) and b), for example. Figure 15 is the same as Figure 12, you should keep just Figure 12 because you explained in the text that the same structure was obtained by two different analysis (NMR and GC/MS). 5. In 3.2 <i>Bioassay of pure compounds isolated from chloroform fraction of C.O (C1, C2 and C3)</i>	Improved Improved on Young scientist in this field would appreciate this figure one as is uncommonly used or available It is evidence base to have these figures. So I prefer it is not deleted rather presented as a, b, and c as in comment. Accepted and corrected as advised Corrected appropriately
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>in alloxan induced diabetic rats section, the part: "There was no statistical significance seen using the FBS change(table 2) but the percentage reduction in blood sugar showed pure compound C2 , C3, and glibenclamide with blood sugar reduction of 17%, 10%, and 18% respectively at the 3rd hour of treatment (table 3). Same scenario was seen at the 2nd hour (9.7%, 8.2%, and 14.4% respectively)." is confusingly written, unclearly, and should be corrected. What does it mean: "There was no statistical significance seen using the FBS change(table 2)"? It should be more specified.</i> Please do not use word "scenario" for the scientific results. It is not appropriate.	Corrected
--	--	-----------



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Rat strain should be indicated. 2. In Materials and methods section, please avoid details like this: “<i>A glass chromatography column was set up. A piece of wool was placed in the bottom of the column, and tamped down with a glass rod. The column was attached to a clamp stand and securely fastened in a vertical position.</i>” because this is obvious. 3. In line 170, it should be (2ml/kg), not (2ml/1kg). 4. The phrase: “<i>And to the best of my knowledge, this</i>”, should be corrected because you must use “our” not “my”, for example: “To our knowledge...”. 5. In the Manuscript title, it is more appropriate to use “characterization” than “elucidation”, i.e. “Isolation and Structural Characterization of the Most Active Antidiabetic Fraction of Corchorus Olitorius Seed Extract”.	Done Removed as adviced. Done corrected Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		