



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14266
Title of the Manuscript:	Modulation of Immunological and Hematological disturbances of diabetes mellitus by Diets containing combined leaves of Vernonia amygdalina and Gongronema latifolium
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	The diabetes problem is very important that is why the manuscript should be published. However not in the current form. some corrections can be done by Authors, eg the p-value parameter has wrong value in line 18 and 21; sometimes written with a capital letter eg line 153; there are different symbols for the same type of cells: CD+4, CD4+ and CD4⁺. Line 82 is 8°C should be 8° C. Line 174 and 175 – uncertainty of measurement should be specified as relative or absolute error, but not mixed in one place. References usually keep the same format, but not here. The substantive comments: First of all in Line 113 we read “Rats whose fasting blood glucose concentration were higher or equal to 200 mg/dl three days after the induction were confirmed diabetic and recruited in the study.” Does this mean that all 70 rats were diabetics? Line 188 “The <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> diet had no dose dependent effect on eosinophil and lymphocyte. Effect on eosinophil was similar at the two levels of inclusion but on lymphocyte was better at the lower level of inclusion.” Line 190, “The <i>Gongronema latifolium</i> diet also had	Agreed. P value is now written correctly in line 18 and 21 as well as CD4⁺ cell. Notation for temperature is corrected. References were corrected. Few rats did not develop diabetes but were re- administered and confirmed diabetic before being recruited into study. Agreed. Correction has been effected Agreed. Correction has been effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	no dose dependent effect on esenophil, lymphocyte, monocyte and CD4⁺ cell count. Effect on esenophil was similar at the two levels of inclusion, on lymphocyte was better at higher dose,” What is true? Discussion: in its present form it is difficult to follow. It should be rewritten in more compact form. The text in Lines from 211 to 216 is repeated. There are plenty of language mistakes, “Report has it that low and Middle....”, “...parameters of diabetic rats are shown in Table 2 and 3 respectfully”, “The normal physiologic response...”	Agreed. Discussion has been modified. Agreed. Necessary corrections effected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issues-: If there are any ethical issues please clarify.	No issues. Ethical permit reference number has been provided
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		