Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMPS_102115**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PHARMACOGNOSTIC PROFILE AND ANTI-DIABETIC ACTIVITY OF Jatropha tanjorensis LINN (EUPHORBIACEAE) LEAF ON ALLOXAN-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:

(https://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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. 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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community.** **2. Yes. But it should be rephrased to better suit the work done** **3. The abstract is comprehensive but lacks problem statement.** **4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate** **5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.** **6. Most of the references are outdated and needs to be revised**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**1.** There are lots of spelling mistakes, grammatical errors and issues with formatting. **2.** Scientific names should be italised **3.** Most of the references used are outdated General discussions of results were poor.	
Optional/General comments	**GENERAL COMMENTS** The authors established the pharmacognostic profile and evaluated the antidiabetic activity of the methanol extract of *Jatropha tanjorensis* Linn. (Euphorbiaceae). The rationale behind the study is not clearly outlined because most of their claims for traditional use of the plant is for other diseases and not diabetes. They mainly said the plant is used to which they sought to establish standards. However as to wide usage of the plant, nothing was mentioned. Even in instances of wide use, the standards would be relevant if the plant bears semblance to a different species. The pharmacognostic standards established would in no way benefit the lay people who use the plant. Microscopy, physicochemical and perhaps the phytochemical screening would only prove useful to researchers and scientists who have the skill to carry them out and understand them. Plant description of the leaf types, shape and other parameters could easily be carried out which could help in the plant identification without complex skill required. There are few typos and grammatical errors which ought to be checked. Long sentences should be avoided and short sentences used. The work, if/when justified appropriately is good for publication. Below are some suggested revisions to be considered: **Major concerns:** 1. The work should be properly justified in terms of the traditional use of the plant.	

	2. Most of the references used are outdated. Recent references should be adopted and used. 3. The mode of diabetes induction (alloxan method) has one of its mechanisms being the formation of Reactive oxygen species (ROS). Its likely possible that the extract acted as an antioxidant agent and not an antidiabetic agent. An antioxidant assay could thus be carried out and a comparative analysis carried out to confirm the significance of the results as an antidiabetic agent. 4. The traditional use and method of preparation of the drug should be considered since methanol and other organic solvents are hardly used in traditional medicine. How would the results be translated to the traditional use by herbalists? **Minor concerns:** **ABSTRACT** 1. Line 6: The problem statement was absent as to the rationale behind the study was absent. 2. Line 13: pharmacognostic profile is developed or established and not evaluated 3. Line 22: Units of results should be spaced form the figures. 4. Line 25: Space out 14 from days. 5. Line 31: Diabetes mellitus should be in italics. **INTRODUCTION** 6. Line 37-40: Long sentence 7. Line 50 – 51: What's the difference between toxicity and little side effects? 8. Line 58: Reference for hypoglycaemic effect. Also, if that's the case, then why the need for the experiment? 9. Line 72-73: There is no mention of the traditional use of the plant to manage diabetes till this point. Also, from the review, the juice is either squeezed from the leaves or prepared with soup. What thus, informed the choice for the use of methanol for extraction? 10. Line 76: Was the picture taken or downloaded from the internet? Don't forget the image has some inscription on it saying India. If it was downloaded, please insert the source reference. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** 11. Line 79: Insert the GPS coordinates of the private garden. 12. Line 80:81: The botanist can easily be misidentified from only the first name. The surname should be added as well. 13. Line 83-84: What informed the mode of drying of the plant material combining shade drying and oven drying? 14. Line 88: What was the age and weight ranges of the animals? 15. Line 97: Why was the phytochemical screening not carried on the leaf? That's what is used traditionally and that could predict the constituents responsible for the observed activities. 16. Line 119: Chemomicroscopy was…. 17. Line 127: acute toxicity was assessed….. 18. Line 129-132: Use short sentences. 19. Line 145: Will the use of 4 animals yield significant results since the least often used is 5.	

	20. Line 148: look at the unit of the weight. Is it mg/kg or mg? 21. Line 161: From the method, 4 animals were used but from your N, it states 5 **RESULTS** 22. Line 170: what type of oils have been indicated as positive? What class of compound is acidity? 23. Line 176: Anomocytic stomata doesn't mean lack of subsidiary cells 24. Line 176: Which trichomes are present? 25. Line 176: Stomatal index and palisade ratio are reported as ranges. 26. Line 179: Tannins have been reported twice 27. Line 185: Figures. Cell types should be labelled clearly. Leaf photomicrographs should be separated from powdered microscopy. Transverse section of the midrib should be clearly labelled. 28. Line 230: What is the significance of moisture content determination? Why did solvent extractives feature organic solvents such as hexane and ethyl acetate? **DISCUSSION** 29. Line 266: What proof can be given to the synergistic activity? Perhaps the activity was even antagonised by one or more constituents. 30. Line 267-271: It should be made general that those phytoconstituents are responsible and not the ones detected in the screening. 31. Line 274-275: Microscopy won't aid plant identification on the farm or in the forest. Thus, other organoleptic features should be explored and presented. 32. Line 279-280: Wont the moisture content be affected by mode of drying and processing? 33. Line 283-284: Which reference was used to establish high and low ash values? 34. Line 297: What classification use outstanding to categorise antidiabetic activity?	

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:	**Desmond Nkrumah**
Department, University & Country	**Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana**