

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_113103
Title of the Manuscript:	Hypoglycemic and hepatoprotective activities of Coriander (Coriandrum sativum) extract in streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats.
Type of the Article	Experimental and original research

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The topic and direction of the experimental research is quite relevant for the development of innovative approaches to the treatment of pathological conditions accompanied by high blood glucose levels (in this case, diabetes mellitus) and functional disorders of the hepatobiliary system. Phyto-objects have a great potential of relevant pharmacological properties, which can be used to create new, promising drugs with minimal side effects on the body compared to synthetic drugs</p> <p>2. The title of the article fully corresponds to the selected objects of research, the experimental design and the set of relevant biomarkers that determine the realisation of the relevant pharmacological effects.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article fully reveals the main principles and results of experimental research.</p> <p>4. The structure and parts of the publication comply with the standards for an experimental article. Parts and subsections of the article are logical, presented competently and at a sufficiently professional level.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Most of the sources used are up-to-date, but there are some outdated sources of literature references. It is desirable to update some of the literature, if possible (literature up to 10 years old, except for literature related to research methods).</p>	Oaky
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language and quality of the chosen language of the article are suitable for scientific communication and popularisation of research results.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The article needs some minor formatting, and there are some stylistic issues that need to be corrected.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	