



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)
Compulsory 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 missing. Please discuss your findings in those section of results.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<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.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Upendarrao Golla
Department, University & Country	Department of Biological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Bhopal, India