



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_4583
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Leaf Ethanol Extract of Coccinia Grandis Lin in glucose and cholesterol lowering activity
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Many grammatical and typo errors Example:</p> <p>a. It should be alloxan-induced rather than alloxan induced</p> <p>b. It should be Whatman filter paper, not what man filter paper.</p> <p>c. "The lowering of blood glucose may achieved..." which should be "may be achieved". ... and several others throughout the text. Perhaps the language should be checked more thoroughly.</p> <p>2. The methodology was not clear enough/ too brief/ not descriptive Example:</p> <p>a. It was mentioned that "the extract was prepared at the rate of 1g/5ml of solvent...", what extract is that? Is it ethanol or aqueous extract? Or the author actually refers to the plant powder? Also, what is the solvent? The author only mentioned 'prepared in solvent', but did not make it clear in the related section of methodology. Although it is indicative in other section, but I think the methodology should be as detail as possible.</p> <p>b. It was mentioned that "the animals</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>were given with water and fed with rat pellet diet”, is it forced feed or ad libitum? This was not clarified in the script.</p> <p>c. The way the author addressed the ‘dose’ should be changed. The author addressed the dose as “2 ml” which is rather vague. If the author is referring to 2 ml of extract, then what is the concentration of the extract in this ‘2 ml of extract’? Also, since the author did not standardize a particular weight for the rats (instead, the weight is in the range of 150 – 200g), the dose should be calculated based on the weight. For example: 50 mg/kg of body weight or whatnot as what they did for the dose of glibenclamide.</p> <p>3. Justification of the methods was not convincing. Example:</p> <p>a. The author used animal of either sex in their experiment, however, it was known that female rats, due to the influence of hormone, has slightly different metabolic profile. I think the author should justify why they use both sexes rather than selecting only one gender.</p> <p>b. The author uses alloxan to induce diabetes in the rats. However, it was well-known that the toxicity of alloxan-induced diabetes is difficult to control. For instance, disruption of blood flow would affect the delivery of alloxan to the pancreatic beta cells and several other disadvantages of using alloxan. A better option such as streptozotocin is more widely used</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>nowadays, why is the author chose alloxan over streptozotocin?</p> <p>c. The analysis method is somehow strange. The author uses only one dose, I don't see the reason of using ANOVA. In my opinion, the author should use unpaired t-test. Perhaps the author could justify this.</p> <p>4. A poorly prepared manuscript Example:</p> <p>a. It was mentioned in the introduction that <i>C. grandis</i> which is the plant used in this study was shown to have glucose-lowering activity in human trial, then why is the author still chose to work on this plant for the same effect? At the same time, the author only "reproduced" the results in animal model and did not elucidate any mechanism of action of the antihyperglycemic effect of <i>C. grandis</i>. This manuscript, therefore, does not contribute significant knowledge or fact to the glucose-lowering effect of <i>C. grandis</i> per se.</p> <p>b. It was mentioned that the extract used in the experiment was ethanol extract, however, in the conclusion part of the abstract section, the author wrote "these results suggest that the aqueous leaf extract..." which I think is a huge mistake that should not happen because there is in nowhere in the manuscript saying that aqueous extract is also prepared for the experiment, so how could such mistake/ confusion happen?</p> <p>c. Some obvious factual errors such as</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>“... reduction of insulin release from the liver...” which should not happen.</p> <p>d. The results were poorly discussed and based too broadly on literature rather than the experimental data. The author suggested a bunch of possible mechanisms which, in my opinion, should be narrowed down. For instance, the author can easily eliminate some possible mechanisms by measuring the serum insulin level or the liver glycogen content. However, none of these were done. Also, the author could easily support their data on the increase in weight in the treatment group by measuring the serum triglyceride level. This was not done either. These indicate that the whole experimental design was not well-planned, resulting in the upshots of the experiments less convincing.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer