



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_44232
Title of the Manuscript:	Lipid peroxidation and Antioxidant Enzymes Assessment in Alloxan Monohydrate Induced Hyperglycaemic Male Wistar Rats following Oral Administration of Theophylline and Glibenclamide
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript was written clearly with only little difficulty for a common man to understand. Overall, the research activities presented here are simple and straight forward. However, I have few comments to the authors and would like to bring to the attention of the Editor in Chief. -The Turnitin score of the full manuscript (including reference) was 43%. Many copy and pasted activities were taken place. Although citations were give, but this is not encouraged. Almost all Introduction chapter was copy and pasted. Same goes to discussion chapter. Example in the lines 37-42; 45-46; 50-57; 158-165, serious copy and paste activity was carried out. Rephrasing these sections is highly needed. -In term of novelty of research, except for Theophylline, the same study for glibenclamide has been already carried out by Bonaventure Chukwunonso Obi et al. (2016) and reported in Journal of Diabetes Research (ISI Impact Factor 2.89). -In material and methods section, the method for estimation of biochemical analysis (catalase, SOD, GPx, MDA) is not mentioned in the manuscript. Please describe in detail how the quantification of these enzymes and oxidative marker was carried out.	Noted, thank you Thank you. Glibenclamide was used as a standard control (positive control) in this study (as in other published literatures) in other to compare the effects of theophylline to not only a negative control (diabetic untreated). Thus the novelty of this study as rightly pointed out is theophylline. Noted. Noted. The ethical approval process seldom provide ethical approval number. Instead each faculty has members who sit in during proposals to ensure the guidelines are observed. Until recently where we can now send proposals and apply for the number Noted. This was an oversight as a template from a



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-No animal ethics number is provided in this manuscript. Animal ethics number is a must for publication regardless submitting the manuscript to any quality of publisher. -In line 19, the authors mentioned that the rats were anesthetized with chloroform in a closed chamber. This is a method for euthanasia which is not acceptable. Please refer to the guideline by European Commission on Euthanasia of Experimental animals (Page 17). This act can lead to the hepatotoxic, nephrotoxic and carcinogenic to the operators and the animals. Chloroform causes excitement before loss of consciousness. The traces of chloroform may present in the serum thus may affect the results. That is the reason ethical number is a must in publication. The ethical committee should not agree on the use of chloroform for anaesthesia and/or euthanasia purpose(s). The acceptance of this paper is depending on the decision of Editor in Chief. -Is there any justification why theophylline at the dose of 10 mg/kg bw is not as good as 5 mg/kg bw? -Please add a table to document body weight measurement of the rats during study period. Loss in body weight is expected in the diabetic control while gaining in the weight is expected for the treated group. -Line 58 change 1.1 to 2.0 and change the rest of the following sections. Suppose introduction is 1.0 then material and method section is 2.0, result is 3.0, discussion is 4.0	previous manuscript was edited in a feat to save time. Corrections have been reflected in the manuscript. Thank you. Good in what aspect please, could you be more specific? Thank you Thank you very much. The results presented in this manuscript are parts of a complex whole. You would have noticed that other parameters like blood glucose level among others are not captured here, reason being that, these have been assembled as part of other publications along side body weight changes during the study. Thank you. Noted Noted, thank you Noted, thank you Route of administration was oral gavage. Stock concentration of drugs was prepared with distilled water.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Line 92, please make necessary changes to the table so that the table will look nicer than now and please give table number. Example Table 1. -Standardize $P < 0.05$ to either $P < 0.05$ or .05 -The authors did not mention the method of administration of the drugs to the rats. Is it oral gavaged? Is the drug prepared with the water or saline?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comment		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes, no animal ethics number is provided and the method for anaesthesia and/or euthanasia is not acceptable.	The proposal was presented to the department and approved taking into consideration the University's ethical requirements and guidelines on animal use and care a while back as the necessary requirement. However, more recent researches unlike this one, from the department now are both approved and an ethical number assigned.