



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11075
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effects of Low- and High-Glycemic Index Diets on Biochemical Variables and Organ Histology in Alloxanized Diabetic Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	The abstract is good but need revision to capture these various parameter for both low and high glycemic index as well as compare them based on their statistical significance by stating the P- values eg.($P < 0.05$ or $P > 0.05$). the last three lines in the abstract need total review for the sentence is grammatically incorrect. Introduction is good but line 57-59 in your introduction need to be reviewed grammatically. In your materials and method please change the first alphabet in the words 'Albino and Wistar' to small letters. For a study that like yours that was carried out in six weeks with adult rats weighing 250g. I doubt how most of your rats did not exceed 300g. please re think. Italize this word "ad libitum". Line 83, please there is a fine difference between diabetic and hyperglycaemic condition. So which did you establish? Line 91, please provide the formular for calculating your GI. If your values are in Mean$\pm$SEM, then you need to include the SEM in your table and ensure that the mean is captured too for the three determinants (table 1). Statistically your result needs total review for easy follow. You used $P < 0.05$ to establish significance yet you present body weight as ($p = 0.001$). Please	Thanks for your comments. Last three lines of the abstract rephrased with statistical significance corrected. Lines 55 -59 grammatically reviewed. Thank you. You are doing great job of eagle eye. Corrections made in the materials and method accordingly. The weights recorded are the exact weight of the experimental rats. In the preliminary studies conducted to determine the form of presenting the yam diets processed in different ways. The roasted yam (HGI) was more preferred to fried yam (LGI) by the rats thus the rate of consumption per day may slightly differ. In the previous study prior to this index study (a follow-up) which has been accepted for publication (awaiting payment) in this same journal, the procedures and formula for determining GI were spelt out but could not be referred to just because it has not been published (although accepted for publication). Not withstanding, the formula is inserted in the Table 1. The proximate composition values of the diets are expressed in mean$\pm$SEM while the GI is expressed as mean$\pm$SD (%). All values reflected it now. Thank you for the comment on the statistical analysis. Corrections have been made accordingly. The table reflects both the body and the various organ weights while the figure shows only the organ weight for cross



SDI Review Form 1.6

	explain? Using the method eg. X vs Y to compare result are internationally and scientifically unaccepted. Please kindly review all your results to capture these corrections. Why are you presenting same results of organ body weights in tables and charts? Why not choose one. Results are in line with study. Discussion is for discussing your results and comparing them to other published findings for or against your results and not for repeating your introduction. Please review your discussion based on this correction. Conclusion is good but how should a patient trying to reduce his hyperglycaemic status as well as avoid weight gain, hyper cholesterol and triacylycerols which eventually will lead to cardiovascular diseases be able to cope with your fried and roasted yam because obviously from your findings both diets will have adverse effects on him or her. I think the choice of fried and roasted yam used for your study is inappropriate for such study. Food for thought. Ensure your reference are in line with the journal format.	sectional comparison. Both are not exactly the same. Thank you sir. Corrections on discussion and reference are correctly appropriated. Thank you. I am grateful for all constructive criticism. All are geared towards producing qualitative and standard publication. Once again thank you. The low GI diet used in this case was purposeful to reflect the impact of processing on biochemical variables and glycemic profile due to alteration on the glycemic index and response. The fact that not all low-GI diets should be concluded straight way to be incorporated into the <u>regular</u> daily menu of the diabetics, the impact of processing of such diets on the biochemical variables should also be considered to avoid antecedent risks.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		