



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_34051
Title of the Manuscript:	Stem Bark Aqueous Extract of Citrus Sinensis Reduces Postprandial Glycaemia Better Than Glibenclamide, An Anti-Diabetic Drug
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	1. The author(s) must justify the use of the dose 400 mg/kg bw for extracts. 2. Spacing of some words. 3. The title is comparative and not in agreement with the aim of the study. Therefore, consider reviewing the title with respect to the following alternative titles; Effects of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> stem bark extracts of postprandial glycemia in normal rats. Phytochemical screening and anti-diabetic evaluation of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> stem bark extracts.	1. The dose was chosen based on OECD Guideline For Testing Of Chemicals: Acute Oral Toxicity – Fixed Dose Procedure. 17th December 2001 2. spacing of word corrected 3. Title accepted
Minor REVISION comments	Line 7: replace 'to' with 'and' so it reads; and study... Line 47: resorption to reabsorption Line 54: represent to present/pose Line 71: remove 'to' Line 259: molecules to compounds Line 269: quality molecules to bioactive compounds Figure 3 is a bar graph not a histogram Table 2: 'positive' control not 'positif' Line 37, 45; Use of the word 'in fact' is not good for scientific writing. Line 128; absorption of glucose	Line 7: done Line 47: done Line 54: done Line 71: done Line 259: done Line 269: done Figure 3: done Table 2: done Line: 37, 45: its use has been reduced all over the MS Line 128: done
Optional/General comments	The study used simple yet scientifically sound methods and well elaborated enabling other researchers to follow. The manuscript is presented in an organized and logic manner.	Thanks