



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24877
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOCHEMICAL ASSESSMENT OF PARKIA BIGLOBOSA ETHANOLIC ROOT EXTRACT IN STREPTOZOTOCIN INDUCED DIABETIC RATS
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 <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	<u>Title</u> Not consistent with the research findings. Need to revise. <u>Abstract</u> <i>Aim:</i> Aim of the study is clear but the findings itself does not reflect what the study was supposed to do. <i>Methodology:</i> Only discuss the allocation of animals but does not describe treatment allocation <i>Results:</i> While the results describe different component of the root extracts the methodology in the text does not provide such information. <i>Conclusion:</i> Not consistent with the data provided <u>Introduction</u> The authors might want to consider re-writing the introduction. It should properly introduces the subject of their research and formulate a research hypothesis/problem why they are doing this study. <u>Materials and methods</u> <i>Experimental animals:</i> Line 89 should read - <i>Sixty adult female rats</i>..... This should also be amended elsewhere in the text. The numbers are not consistent 60 rats but allocation indicates 6x8=48, what	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	happened to the other 12. Line 108: should be <i>One hundred grams</i> written in text (100g). Good to start first sentence with text and not numbers. Determination of liver enzymes (ALT, AST & ALP etc including albumin) should just mentioned the how these enzymes were measured and results recorded than describing reactions. This also apply for lipid profile determination. In the abstract under result section phytochemical screening is mentioned and provided information on the plants constituents. In the method section, the methodology does not describe how these constituents were obtained. There is obvious disconnect. <u>Results</u> Only Figures are presented without text to explain what the graphs mean. How to authors expect readers to understand what the graphs mean. <u>Discussion</u> The discussion is not consistent with the aim of the study. The authors might need to revise the discussion. The authors may want to focus their discussion on biochemical changes observed if so the aim of the study might have to change or effect of plant extracts on diabetes. <u>Conclusion</u> Not based on data.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<u>General Comments</u> The authors might want to consider revising the manuscript.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Francis W. Hombhanje</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Centre for Health Research & Diagnostics, Divine Word University, Guinea</i>