

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
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	

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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Where is your research positioned, among the many studies on PUTRANJIVA ROXBURGHII as an anti-diabetic? Explain in more detail in the introduction section.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The scope of the title is too broad. The word "in vitro" should be replaced with a more specific word. Check the typography, in the writing of periods.	
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.	Appropriate	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why did you use metformin as a positive control, instead of acarbose which is an alpha-amylase inhibitor? The research objectives written in the abstract and in the introduction are not in line. What biochemical alteration did you mean? How do you treat the extract from the soxhletation stage until it is ready to be reacted with the enzyme? Explain in detail. Is it true that you reacted 20 uL of substrate (soluble starch) and 100 uL of DNSA with 80 mL of extract+amylase mixture? You wrote Absorbance 1 (control) and Absorbance 2 (standard) in the calculation formula. What do you mean by standard and control here? Iodine assay method is exactly the same as https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318285839_In-Vitro_Antidiabetic_Activity_of_Clinacanthus_nutans_Extracts. Indication of plagiarism. At what stage is the iodine added? What statistical methods did you use to analyze your data? Don't start a sentence with a Greek letter. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>9. Display the inhibition data in the form of Mean \pm SD in the table. Mark the significance.</p> <p>10. Table 2 position is separate from the header caption.</p> <p>11. The result of the inhibition value recalculation is not the same as that written in the % inhibition column. Please check again.</p> <p>12. You didn't do any phytochemical testing. Therefore you shouldn't mention it in the conclusion.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not sufficient. The writing of citations and reference lists is inconsistent.	
Minor REVISION comments	Sufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tri Wiyono
Department, University & Country	National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia