



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_22434
Title of the Manuscript:	Leaf ethanolic extract of <i>Bauhinia monandra</i> increases insulin secretion in rats subjected to intrauterine malnutrition
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript describes the effect of ethanolic extract of leaves of <i>Bauhinia monandra</i> on insulin levels in malnutrition rats. This was an interesting study with reasonable experimental design and the objectives were achieved to an extent. Following are my suggestion for improvement of the current manuscript: 1) I feel that there is some connection missing between the paragraphs of 'Introduction' section. 2) Also, the last paragraph of 'Introduction' section, just describes the study there in the manuscript. Please make a clear statement on the aims or objectives and the motivation behind it to do so to be incorporated. 3) In the results and discussion section, The entire discussion is elaborated in the 3.2 section. Some part of it looks like introduction. Please try to make a connection between your data and the literature. 4) After 3.3, there is directly '3.5' section in the Results and discussion. How about the '3.4' section? 5) The discussion for results 3.3 & 3.5 sections is	We thank the referees for their generally positive comments and suggestions for improvement of the manuscript. We made the changes suggested along the paper. Please find our specific replies below. 1) We agree with the reviewer's comments and edited the text. 2) We agreed with the reviewer's comments and edited the text. 3) We agreed with the reviewer's comments and edited the text adding some comments to the Introduction section to connect our results with the literature. 4) Sorry, it was a mistake and has been corrected in the text. 3.5. Section corresponded to 3.4. Section. We joined Sections 3.3 and 3.4 5) We agreed with the reviewer's comments and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	missing. Please discuss your findings in those section of results.	added the discussion in the section 3.3.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	a) In some of the sections, the abbreviations and their too much usage look confusing and complex. Try to make it clear wherever possible. For instance, the abstract itself uses so many of abbreviations, though mentioned it in the beginning. Ethical Issues: YES. The ethical committee approval number for this study was missing.	a) We agree with the reviewer's comments and edited the text. The ethical committee approval number was added in the text: "All experiments have been examined and approved by the Ethic Committee from the Centro de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (document number 35/05)."
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		