



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	Research 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	1. The arrangement of the results is confusing 2. The results of the toxicity study is not included 3. However, the investigations did not explore on the probable antihyperglycemic action of the plant. This statement is very wrong, several research and review have discussed the mechanism of action of the plant as an antihyperglycemic agent 4. The results and discussion section should be rewritten, it is poorly written. 5. Ethical Issues: Ethical Approval: All authors hereby declare that 'principle of laboratory animal care' were followed. All experiment have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee. This statement can't replace the ethical approval, which ethics committee approved the work, the university or faculty or department. The animal ethical committee or which one. The issue of ethics should be explained better. Plagiarism issue: There are traces of plagiarism in the work, i found this in the last paragraph of the result section. I suggest you run the whole article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. If a toxicity is to be done, there should be a group that will receive only the extract	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. Heading 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 are all one, it should be acute toxicity study 3. The discussion didn't discuss the results of the biochemical markers 4. It is wrong to say significant difference was accepted at $P=0.05$, what happened to the values that are less than 0.05 5. In the table, what does the alphabet a, b, c and d means	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Antidiabetic potential have been explored and several works have been done on it. This work didn't add anything new to what is known. The various biochemical markers targeted have been studied by previous work. Maybe if the authors revisit the study and do some more investigation like body weight changes, histological changes and any molecular study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Balogun Wasiu Gbolahan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria</i>