



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25404
Title of the Manuscript:	OXIDANT-ANTIOXIDANT STATUS AND RENAL FUNCTION IN WISTAR RATS AFTER ADMINISTRATION OF Vernonia amygdalina FRACTIONS IN STREPTOZOTOCIN INDUCED DIABETES MELLITUS
Type of the Article	Original 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript provides useful experimental data on the effect of Vernonia amygdalina extract on fasting blood glucose level, levels of antioxidant enzymes catalase and superoxide dismutase (SOD) as well as malondialdehyde (MDA) content in blood samples of rats exposed to several treatments including Vernonia amygdalina extract. Since I am a plant biologist, I have no experience with experiments using animals thus I do not know whether all the treatments described in the manuscript were appropriate including all ethical aspects of animal treatments; however, I hope that they were adequate due to the approval of bioethics committee as declared by the authors (line 184). I have only a major comment on the statistical evaluation of the experimental data - I do not understand the symbols used by the authors. Instead, I would recommend to use analysis of variance (ANOVA), multiple comparisons tests such as LSD 0.05 or Duncan's multiple range test (DMRT) for statistical evaluation of the data presented in the figures. Furthermore, I have several formal comments on the manuscript:	The definitions of the symbols is as follows; a- Significant increase in treatment group when compared with the control group. b- Significant decrease in treatment group when compared with the control group. (*)- significant increase in treatment group when compared with the diabetic control group. (#)- significant decrease in the treatment group when compared with the diabetic control group. The statistical tool used was ANOVA and the multiple comparison was done with LSD. (This was omitted in the article, but has been stated now). All corrections have been done as suggested by the reviewer and heightened in yellow shades.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Abstract, line 11: The word form has to be corrected - not “eventual”, but “eventually” Line 238: Correct the spelling in the word “Catalase” (not “Catalse”) Lines 239, 242: Insert a space between a number and a corresponding unit in “50 mM”, “240 nm”, and further in the manuscript text. Line 251: Correct the unit in the word “0.3 mM” (not “0.3Mm”) Lines 283, 311: Correct the spelling in the chemical term “ethyl acetate” (not “ethyl acteate”) Line 292: Correct the spelling in the words “catalase activity” (not “catatlase activity”) Line 310: Correct the word form in the words “a significant decrease” (not “a significant decreased”) Line 333: Insert “a” before the words “significant reduction”, i.e., “a significant reduction” Line 355: Insert “a” before the words “consequent decrease”, i.e., “a consequent decrease” References: The references cited in the manuscript text but missing in the Reference list: Line 346: Ajabnoor 1990; Line 260: Buege and Aust 1978; Line 345: Koshimizu et al. 1994; Line 357: Ogunlade et al. 2012 - these references have to be added to the Reference list.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Extra references listed in the Reference list but not cited in the manuscript text which have to be removed from the Reference list: Bauer et al. 1982; Coresh et al. 2003; Hill et al. 2003 Discrepancies between the references cited in the manuscript text and listed in the Reference list: Line 377: Loeb 1991 - Reference list: Loeb 1999 Line 95: Heilig 2006 - Reference list: Heilig and Brosius 2006 Line 89: Rehman et al. 2005 - Reference list: Rehman et al. 2012 In the reference “Boon et al.” in the Reference list, the year “2007” is missing - it has to be added there(line 410 in the Reference list)	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		