



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_45396
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of anti-diabetic properties of Bridelia stipularis L. (Leaves) on alloxan induced Type-2 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>)

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 work extends earlier studies from previous work published in Journal of Pharmacy Research 2015,9(3),190-193 demonstrating that Bridelia scandens suppresses blood glucose levels in streptozotocin diabetic rats. While the antidiabetic activities are previously well established, the authors claim for providing a novel anti-diabetic plant extract by assessing the effects on alloxan is too far from convincing. However, they have provided additional data on lipid profiles and SGPT/SGOT/creatinine that could add up to the existing knowledge about the diabetic control provided by this plant. The authors need to emphasize these aspects of diabetes and the role played by the plant extract in controlling the lipid profiles and the impact on the measures of tissue damage (SGOT/SGPT/creatinine). I recommend minor changes in discussion after which the manuscript can be acceptable.	
Minor REVISION comments	Data indicating the role played by the plant extract in controlling the lipid profiles and the impact on the measures of tissue damage (SGOT/SGPT/creatinine) needs to be explained more. I recommend minor changes in discussion after which the manuscript can be acceptable.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muruganandan Shanmugam
Department, University & Country	Wayne State University, United States of America