SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research**
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** *(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 paper studies the glucose and cholesterol-lowering effect of *Coccinia grandis*'s leaf extract in normal and diabetic rats. While these parameters are interesting to study, they are not exactly new with regards to this plant. The authors themselves have pointed this out multiple times in their manuscript. Their claim that it has never been studied before using extract of ethanol medium is not acceptable as one of the papers they cited actually used ethanol extract in their study. The authors should give specific reasons why this current research is significant from the other studies and why is it important to have it published since it is reporting already known knowledge . Taking into account the possibility that this manuscript does get published, I think it is appropriate to include the following comment: The manuscript contains occasional amounts of grammatical and typographical problems (which I do not list here). The authors could resolve these problems by thoroughly reading the manuscript and seeking advice from a native English speaker or a language editor. Problems of this sort (while minor) should definitely not appear in print.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be considered for publication ONLY if the authors could provide justification for carrying out a study that is considered a repetition. In my point of view, there is still merit in what the authors are trying to contribute. Therefore, I suggest that perhaps the manuscript could be shortened to the Brief Communication format.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer