

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_127183
Title of the Manuscript:	AN APPROACH TO ANTI-DIABETIC POTENTIAL OF PUTRANJIVA ROXBURGHII WALL. LEAVES BY IN VITRO MODELS
Type of the Article	Original article (Experimental)

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This is good attempt made by the author in the field of non-communicable diseases. A commonly available herb Putrajivaka, (leaves) known for various pharmacological actions is evaluated for in vitro anti-diabetic activity by Alpha-amylase inhibitory and starch iodine assay. It will relay anti-diabetic activity by inhibiting the breakdown of the starch into glucose and maltose which will maintain the glucose level in the blood of diabetic patient.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Quite suitable, however alternative is provided</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Yes. Its comprehensive. Suggested some minor additions</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes. Structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>Yes. It is technically sound. Methodology to be rewritten. Minor revision is required to be scientifically robust.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	<b>References are sufficient. Minor revision is required. Kindly follow the journal's reference style.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Improve English language and grammar	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Sushama Sumeet Shivgankar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>