

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_99761
Title of the Manuscript:	THE RATE OF GLUCOSE UPTAKE BY THE CELLS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY USING DIFFERENT ANTICOAGULANTS
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.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/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)
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- Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. 2- Yes, the title fits to contents. 3- Yes, comprehensive. 4- The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and suitable. 5- Yes, it is scientifically correct. 6- The references are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good English quality	
Optional/General comments	Please add (the CNS does not need insulin for entrance of glucose inside the cells)	

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:	Ziad H. Deleme
Department, University & Country	University of Mosul, Iraq