

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78628
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti –diabetic activity of <i>Murraya koenigii</i> – A comprehensive review
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript titled “Anti –diabetic activity of <i>Murraya koenigii</i> – A comprehensive review” reviewed antidiabetic activities <i>M. koenigii</i> through the literature survey of scientific articles. The review is very well written; the review described very well the application of <i>M. koenigii</i> in the treatment of diabetes. However, I have the following observation and requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The language is tedious and some expressions are not proper, this manuscript must be polished and revised by the native speaker. For example, “Because existing synthetic medications have various drawbacks, researchers are still looking for better anti-hyperglycemic treatments.”, “Plant-derived active components that have shown action as in treatment of diabetes include alkaloids, glycosides, galactomannan gun, polysaccharides, peptidoglycans, hypoglycin, guanidine, steroids, sugars, glycopeptides, terpenoids, amino acids, and inorganic ions [Grover et al.,2002].”, “Only two <i>Murraya</i> species, <i>M. koenigii</i> and <i>M. paniculate</i> are found in India, out of 14 worldwide.” Restructure these sorts of sentences throughout the manuscript to give a clear message. 2) Better to include current stats related to diabetes and its expenditure in the introduction. 3) Make the front of the botanical/taxonomic name in italic. 4) Give full details of traditional and medicinal uses of <i>M. koenigii</i> with more researches on literature. 5) In the manuscript, <i>in vivo</i>, and <i>in vivo</i> preclinical data should be mentioned with proper citation. 6) Request Authors to make an extensive survey and collect all the information of phytochemicals and herbal extracts from <i>M. koenigii</i> for the management of diabetes. 7) Discuss about the phytochemicals present in <i>M. koenigii</i> and their roles in the management of diabetes through search in articles, books, etc. 8) Request authors to mention about the mechanism of action of phytochemicals and herbal extracts of <i>M. koenigii</i> in the management of diabetes. 9) The section Conclusion or Discussion is very short, and I think the Authors should implement this section by describing better the translational value of the <i>in vivo</i> and <i>in vivo</i> preclinical data described in the manuscript and also mention if some 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>clinical trials are going on or in general, date in humans. I will also suggest to describe the pro and cons of using <i>M. koenigii</i> to treat diabetes, and also mention any potential side effects??</p> <p>10) Proper management of references is required. Cite the references properly. Request to cross-check references, whether they have been cited correctly or not.</p> <p>11) Statements like “Even though literature lists over 400 plant species with hypoglycemic action, hunting for new anti-diabetic medications from natural plants remains appealing since they contain chemicals that have alternative and harmless effects on diabetes mellitus.”, “<i>M. koenigii</i>’s leaves, roots, bark, and fruit have been demonstrated to support a range of biological activities.”, and many more similar statements in the manuscript should be properly cited.</p> <p>12) More recent references should be added</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bikash Adhikari
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal