



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJPR_30369</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Investigation of Enzymes Binding to “Voglibose- An Antidiabetic Drug” and the choice of Enzyme to be used for Biosensing</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript details an investigation on the starch hydrolase inhibitory activities of Voglibose and thereby, the substantiation of its position as an anti-diabetic drug. While the experimental methodology and the findings are of interest, major revisions are required to bring the manuscript into proper order before publication. The following are the revisions required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The language used throughout the manuscript is awkward. The authors are recommended to obtain the assistance of a native English language speaker to rectify the language errors.</li> <li>(2) The Introduction is better arranged without sub-headings. The importance of starch hydrolase inhibitors in the mitigation of diabetes should be stressed out in relation to the currently available anti-diabetic treatments with this mechanism of action.</li> <li>(3) Section 2.1.2, more technical details on the active site identification needs to be included.</li> <li>(4) Overall, the materials and methods section has been drafted like a laboratory manual rather than a research paper. The authors are recommended to take a look at other manuscripts published in this journal in order to have a better idea as to how this particular section is composed.</li> <li>(5) Figures 1 and 2 appear to have been taken out of a textbook. Either appropriate permissions should be obtained or the illustrations should be removed from the manuscript.</li> <li>(6) Tables 2 – 6 should be expressed in the form of a</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>graph.</p> <p>(7) The results and discussion sections also appear to be in the form of a laboratory report rather than a research manuscript. Significant revisions are required to bring this section to proper formatting.</p> <p>(8) The references have been listed out in a haphazard manner instead of uniform formatting.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript requires significant revision in terms of rectifying formatting errors and bringing the content to appear like a research publication rather than a laboratory manual and report.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	None	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	None	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b><i>Viduranga Waisundara</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>National Institute of Fundamental Studies, Sri Lanka</i></b>