SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJPR_7244**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Aqueous Extract of Guava (Psidium guajava) Leaf on Blood Glucose and Liver Enzymes in Alloxan Induced Diabetic Rats**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Paper**

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	We have presented our suggestions and comments in order to give appropriate attention to the style of the paper and to clarify the ambiguity of the data and to refine its content. This manuscript describe the effect of the aqueous extract from leaves of *Psidium guajava* on body weight, blood glucose level, liver indices of toxicity as ALP, AST and ALT. However, the manuscript requires major revisions before it can be considered for publication in the British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research. In fact, many previous reports described and clarify the mechanism underlying the hypoglycemic effect of *Psidium guajava* (Oh et *al.*, 2005; Huang et *al.*, 2011; Eidenberger et *al.*, 2013; Soman et *al.*, 2013). Hence, this manuscript did not evidence any novelty and constitutes a preliminary study. Furthermore, several issues that may alter the reported results and deserve attention were found in the	

	present version of brief report and are listed below: **In the abstract:** -Line 6: …the effect of Psidium guajava leaf (precise the leaf extract in the abstract) - Line 7: correct liver enzymes in alloxan… - (Line 7-9): the group C treatment is missing. - Line 11: the author choose group E as diabetic untreated group of rats why he write "group D (normal control), group E 150mg/kg, (untreated diabetic control)" , here the author should be attentive to those kind of mistakes that can confuse all further results! -Line 13: ……. blood glucose not sugar - Line 15: the period of this study is between December 2011 and July 2012 (please clarifies the ambiguity here and tells us it means a period of treatment or period of the entire experiments) **Introduction**	

	-Line 29… blood glucose level - Line 33: verify the number cited (500 million) and add reference because in other reports the prevalence of diabetes for the year 2030 would reach 439 million of patient (Wild et *al.*, 2004). **Material and methods** - The choice of 6 rats in each group is not statistically sufficient to evidence obtained results. (8 animals at least in each group). - Line 67: add period of leaves collection - Line 87: intraperitoneal injection of freshly dissolved alloxan monohydrate (100mg/kg) add reference - The procedure of inducing diabetes is missing important data following the injection of alloxan (administration of glucose to treated rats to prevent hypoglycemia…, % of mortality induced by alloxan and aqueous extract doses). How author could verify the diabetic statute of rats. From which blood glucose levels, the authors considered that animals are diabetic?	

	- The procedure of collection and analysis of blood specimen is missing from important data too. The anesthesia of diabetic rats by chloroform is not recommended in this type of experiment because anesthesia can interfere with the glucose metabolism by increasing blood glucose level of stressed animals so animals should be sacrificed by decapitation. This effect appears clearly in author's results concerning blood glucose levels in all groups. - lines (106-107): The blood samples were allowed to clot and were spun in bench centrifuge (MSE England) at 3000 rpm for 5min to obtain sera. The serum was not obtained with these parameters of centrifugation. Serum should be obtained at (4000 rpm for 15 min). - Temperature of storage of sea sample? **Results:** There are important concerns that should be discussed in author's results. - In table 2: the control groups showed a glycemia > 9 mmol/L (1.64 g/L) or as shown in several reports, glycemia of control rats did not exceed 6 mmol/L (1,1 to	

	1,2 g/L). Results need explanation. The main explanation was the use of chloroform in anesthesia. - Why ALP and AST were not changed in diabetic rats? Authors should discuss these results in contradiction with other studies showing that those indices exhibited an increase in diabetic rats. - Why authors did not add the pancreas and liver histology to confirm their results? Actually I find hard to be convinced by results obtained .	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer