

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77493
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Role of Medicinal Plants in the Management of Diabetes Mellitus: Future Prospective</b>
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**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</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Better to modify the title or include notes about future prospective of MPs use in diabetes mellitus in your document.</li> <li>2. There are so many grammatical and typographical errors to be corrected. The document needs more revision in this regard.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid words like crore which may not be easy to understand to readers</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Include search strategy in the abstract section, how many MPs have been accessed and included in the review</li> <li>4. Better to be careful to use some terms in diabetes such as hyperlipidemia because diabetes does not cause increments of all lipid parameters (see HDL vs. LDL), so better to use the term dyslipidemia in your review</li> <li>5. In the abstract part, there is a statement that MPs have fewer side effects compared to conventional medicines. Where you got this information? Please include such data in the result and/or in the discussion part if there is enough data to conclude like this? From Systematic review, and/or meta-analysis?</li> <li>6. At the end of introduction section, you explained that Web of Science was chosen and ---so on. And also you stated that data were retrieved from Pub Med, Web of Science and Google Scholar. Please explain the reason why you chose the three databases rather than explain only about the one.</li> <li>7. Please write more about each selected MP, what you wrote is narrow, not enough. Please broaden by searching more references</li> <li>8. What are your inclusion and exclusion criteria regarding the search of MPs (Clinical trials or preclinical studies or both; MPs in the world, some continents, some countries). Please clarify and include in the document.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You stated in discussion part that your focus was on MPs which are very effective; how do you assure their very effectiveness?</li> <li>• It may also better to use quality assessment criteria to select studies which will be included in the review</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. Mention how many MPs you got in the search, construct table in which other MPs data (data of MPs not written their detail in the text) will be written within it.</li> <li>10. Please follow the journal guideline to prepare the manuscript (title, heading, subheading styles, references (in text citation, bibliography))</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write the long term of words at their first use. E.g. FT-IR, and SEM</li> <li>2. Is discussion necessary for this review? If so what are you going to discuss? Your discussion in the current content does not add any information to the document.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The discussion part needs more revision (discussion should be between studies finding and why results vary etc.). Therefore, the discussion should be organized in such a way.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Add conclusion in your document</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document may contribute information to the scientific community if it will be organized well.</li> <li>• The document is poorly written, more references (studies about MPs better to be searched and included based on the defined criteria)</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Taklo Simeneh Yazie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia</b>