SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJPR_13479**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of Antidiabetic Activity of Combination of Trace Elements**
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	The idea to compare the anti-diabetic activity of the combination of the trace elements is original and authors demonstrated it very well. The methodology and discussion of the results elucidate the hypothesis. The manuscript was perfectly written. I may recommend publication in British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research.	
Minor REVISION comments	The data are very well presented, but the number of figures and tables is high. I could recommend to give some of the data in the supplementary part or simply to confuse the similar data. It will change the manuscript to more easily readable text.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Turkey**