



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_4117
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of microbial purity, acute and subchronic toxicities of a Nigerian commercial polyherbal formulation used in the treatment of diabetes mellitus
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>It is highly desirable that investigators try to fill up the gaps in this study to make it OECD guidelines compliant for acute and sub-acute toxicity studies. An estimate of NOAEL should be made. This study should have provided results for male/female animals separately to make it more informative.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It seems 30-day study is sub-acute rather than sub-chronic as described in section 2.7 Pg 9. 2. Food/ water intake profile to be included in this study. 3. Table 3 to be converted to figure. 4. Statistical symbols are missing in Table 1 and Table 6. 5. Organ-to-body weight ratios should be determined, since in some groups body weight gain is evident. 6. Introduction section should be reduced to 1/3 of the present. There area several repetitive statements in Introduction and Discussion section, which should be modified/ improved. 7. The dose used in animal studies should be 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>correlated with human dose on the basis of body weight / surface area.</p> <p>8. Statements referring to increased `absorption of iron' (Line 300 Pg 13) ; and `stimulation of erythropoietin release' (Line 304 Pg 13) ; `...polyherbal medicine did not regenerate anaemia...' (Line 314 Pg 14) are speculative and should be avoided.</p> <p>9. Many references are in excess – one example is Line 309 on Pg 14.</p> <p>10. Abstract need rewriting making it more focussed towards the objective of the investigation.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>In general this is a good study. Nicely planned and well written. Experiments with respect to microbial purity and histology are satisfactory and well performed. Statistical evaluation is good.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh K Johri
Department, University & Country	PK PD Toxicology Division, Indian Institute of Integrative Medicine, Canal Road, Jammu 180 001 , India