



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_27598
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Solvent Fractions of Balanites aegyptiaca Stem-bark Ethanolic Extract on Glucose Metabolic Enzymes in Diabetic Rats
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	- In the Introduction, it was missing a paragraph talking about the treatments available for Diabetes to make it clear that it is important to seek new treatment options and that medicinal plants have great potential to help in this search. - Still in Introduction, it is necessary to mention that the anti-diabetic activity of <i>B. aegyptiaca</i> was mainly reported in the aqueous fraction (you have this information in your references) and to cite the compounds that have already been isolated from this fraction. This information makes it clear why the choice of using the aqueous fraction and what compounds may be related to this activity. - For me, it was not clear why you used the stem-bark in the experiment while the references I found mention the <i>B. aegyptiaca</i> fruits are the ones related to its activity. I think essential to include this explanation. Ethical Issues: The experiment with rats, which the author declare to have been approved the appropriate ethics committee.	It was noted and has been in concluded. The literature surveyed actually investigated fruit part of the plant in combating diabetes, however, no data on antidiabetic effect of the stem-bark despite the report that its contain some important metabolites. In addition, all other suggestions where considered and corrected as found in the attached copy.
Minor REVISION comments	- All text correct %: Example 10% in the abstract and not 10 %. - In Materials and Methods you should divide Plant Collection and Extraction into 2 topics. - In Materials and Methods you should divide	It was noted and corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Animals and Grouping into 2 topics; and include a line about Ethical Approval in Animals. • Check References 11 and 13, they seem to be the same. • Review the citation of references in all the text. • Complete the title with: Streptozotocin Diabetic Rats • Results and Discussion: The author quote references 40 and 41 about the antidiabetic effect of triterpenes. It should be more appropriate quote reference about tannins and flavonoids, that was the focus of manuscript.	It was noted and corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript describes the anti-hyperglycemic effect of aqueous-fraction of <i>Balanites aegyptiaca</i> Stem-bark ethanolic extract on enzymes of glucose metabolism in streptozotocin diabetic. The manuscript is quite interesting. In the scientific literature, there are 2 papers studying the same species in the antidiabetic activity, but the fruit and saponin rich fraction (reference 15 and "Aldose reductase inhibition of a saponin-rich fraction and new furostanol saponin derivatives from <i>Balanites aegyptiaca</i>" Although I consider this manuscript in a good shape to be published, I have some comments and suggestions to improve them, and the authors need to make corrections before it being fully accepted. It is a preliminary study, because there is not the total chemical characterization of aqueous fraction. In addition the doses used are high.	Work is on progress to characterized the bioactive compound(s). The dose is not high cause Samir et al 2002 used 800 mg/kg body wt of the plant's fruit and administered to diabetic rats and were reported to be safed..