

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_88552
Title of the Manuscript:	“An Investigation of Insulinotropic Potential of Herbal Plants for Management of Diabetes”
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 dealing with effect of herbal methanolic extraction as antidiabetic drugs by its inhibitory action on DPP-IV which is the enzymes that catabolic GLP-1, the herbal medication was old subject of knowledge which nowadays concern large attention, because many chemical drugs show bad side effect specially when used for long treatment, the manuscript was important in field, the title was good and descriptive the idea, the abstract required more attention and should rewrite carefully to explain aim and methodology and introduction was fair, methodology required some correction, result was good but required to be more correct in illustrated, the regression formula must put on figure, also their was tow IC50 value found in manuscript this make the question to be which one was the correct ?? the statistical analysis that he used was based on T test on excel sheet but Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test was noted in some table this should be clarify, all tables and figures have no comment or to explain any plant extract was the best, discussion must be rewrite again including the best result and with how this result was agree or disagree, also why we have this result ,in this manuscript the required to identify the main compounded found in plant methanolic extraction that do tis drug action this will give originality to manuscript, the reference was suitable but its not writing in main text as journal style.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract ; 1- Please correct the abstract as I noted in main text 2- The aim should be put clearly in your abstract 3- No abbreviation was allowed to be in abstract Introduction: 1- Correct it as noted in main text 2- In all manuscript Please unify all the reference typing according to journal policy 3- The aims of your study should be added in introduction Methodology: 1- Correct it as I noted in main text 2- Rewrite some paragraph in methodology to be clearer to reader 3- technical approach from the ELISA company you should note it but not write it 4- Used statistical programme to analysis the data result: 1- All figure and table should contain descriptive comment to explain it 2- how you calculate IC50 inhibitor (261,241,99.46) which higher that concentration used so you should re calculation it? 3- please put all the regression formula in the figure note that you should use the regression of standard to compare all plant extracted to give inhibition percentage 4- you used ELISA not MTT assay (The MTT assay is a colorimetric assay for assessing cell metabolic activity.[1] NAD(P)H-dependent cellular oxidoreductase enzymes may, under defined conditions, reflect the number of viable cells present. These enzymes are capable of reducing the tetrazolium dye MTT, which is chemically 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide, to its insoluble formazan, which has a purple colour) so remove it if you not work it or add it if you work. 5- you should add the mean, and correct the significant p to be more accurate for each tested group in table 6 6- are you used T test or Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test Please correct this 7- please in figure 2 please put the significant with SEM discussion: 1- the first paragraph was not discussion, you should discuss your result and mention which was the best plant extraction that give more effect on your study and why, also give agree result that have similar result and how your result disagree with other research and why this result change between you and them. 2- Please discuss the main hypothesis about the inhibition action of plant extract on DPP-IV and how it works References: Less than 1% was in the last 5 years please update your references</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Ammar Mahmood Al-Aalim
Department, University & Country	Mosul University, Iraq