



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_44203
Title of the Manuscript:	Liver Enzymes and Hepatic Histomorphological Assessment in Alloxan Monohydrate Induced Hyperglycaemic Male Wistar Rats treated with Glibenclamide and Theophylline
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>)

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. You did not give information how to collect blood for measuring liver enzymes. How were these enzymes measured? Were these measurements standardized? 2. You should not use the word "decrease liver enzyme" but should use the word "its level was lower than that detected in group II or diabetic rats. Because the results were not less than that found in group I or normal rats which represented the normal range. 3. Fatty change in the liver is an abnormal status. It is not found in normal, thus, you should not use the word "decrease fatty infiltration" as well. You may use "less fatty change was found in theophylline group compared with the DM group". 4. The figures are not clear. They should be in a higher resolution. 5. Your results do not support the effect of theophylline in preventing hepatocytes in contrast to your conclusion. As a reader, I cannot agree with your conclusion.	Thank you very much, i have done that now. Noted Thank you very much, I have taken note of it. I will go through it and recast it accordingly
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) Yes, but there was no an approval declared.	Thank you very much. It was an omission. I have declared the approval in the paper now