

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80154
Title of the Manuscript:	“Resistance Exercise Reduces the Necessity for Hypoglycemic Agent (Humulin) In Overweight Women with Gestational Diabetes Mellitus”
Type of the Article	Not clear

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>)

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><i>The paper needs an English revision by an English speaker.</i></p> <p>Abstract, title and references</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The aim is clear.• It not clear what the study found and how they did it.• The title is informative and relevant, but what do you mean by (Resistance Exercise)?• The references: are relevant, but not recent (most are too old), and written in proper way, also they are not used though all the paper. You should change the references by more recent and to use them after each paragraph. When you use abbreviation, you should mention the whole terms for the first time, <p>Introduction/background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is clear what is already known about this topic, but again poor language, need to be revised and to be supported by references. <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The process of subject selection is clear.• The variables are not defined and measured appropriately.• There is no enough detail in order to replicate the study. <p>The type of study is not clear, when and where it was done? this should be mentioned in the methods, is your study pro or retrospective?</p> <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The data is not presented in an appropriate way.• There is no Tables or figures. <p>There are no clear results.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The discussion need revision and to be supported by references.• The conclusions answer the aims of the study.• The conclusion is not supported by references or results. <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The study design is not clear, where is the comparison group? And where are the total results?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The major flaws of this article<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Few numbers of cases.2. No clear comparison groups.3. No clear results.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thayer M. Aboush
Department, University & Country	EI khansa'a Hospital, Iraq