

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_99209
Title of the Manuscript:	Linagliptin in combination with <i>Embllica officinalis</i> improves glycemic control through alleviating dyslipidemia and oxidative stress on streptozotocin 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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 REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript studied the antidiabetic properties of the fruits of <i>Embllica officinalis</i> in combination with linagliptin through the hypoglycemic, hypolipidemic and hepatoprotective effects. Due the global importance of the Diabetes mellitus, this study results relevant for the scientific community 2. The title is adequate for the study realized, reflecting the object of study 3. The abstract requires to be reframed for reflecting the experimental results and to highlight the results, especially if the information generated is the first report in the literature 4. The subsections and general structure and organization of the manuscript are appropriate 5. The methodology and the experimental steps are according with the general international scientific literature and the Discussion section contrast the results observed with the reports already published 6. The references cited are adequate, however the format of this section is not homogeneous: sometimes the year of publication are in bold, punctuation is not consistent, spaces between words, etc.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. English language has to be corrected, especially in the Abstract section	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The main concern of this manuscript is that the scientific name of the plant studied is currently considered as synonym, consequently, the scientific name has to be corrected according with WFO (WorldFloraOnline). Moreover, obviously, the hole manuscript needs to be reviewed in order not only to correct the scientific name, but also to consider similar or to contrast with other results from the same plant family.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maira Estrella Huerta Reyes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto Mexicano Del Seguro Social, Mexico</b>