

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_103538
Title of the Manuscript:	An Assessment of Anti-Diabetic Potentility of Ethanolic Extract of Andrographis paniculata in Alloxan Induced Rat Model.
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:

(<https://www.journalijanr.com/index.php/IJANR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1- The manuscript idea is important for scientific community. There are many things are missing in the results. The manuscript was prepared with non-interested and non- professional way.  2- Yes  3- Yes  4- No  5- No, many results not stated  6- No, the author not more recent references, the most recent one at 2013	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The tables 2&3 no results were written in them	

### 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)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Omnia Mohamed Helmy Mohamed Kamel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>