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	1. At lines 10 and 91, you should describe the administration method of test sample, for example, through a gastric tube or by intravenous injection. 2. At line 11, you should describe "group C 100 mg/kg, group D none (normal control), group E none (diabetic control), group F 150 mg/kg (extract control)". 3. At lines 22 and 195-196, "non-significant ($p<0.05$) effect" should be revised to "no side effects", because ALT decreased significantly. 4. At line 53, you should refer the review, "Gutiérrez RM, Mitchell S, Solis RV. *Psidium guajava*: a review of its traditional uses, phytochemistry and pharmacology. J Ethnopharmacol. 2008 Apr 17;117(1):1-27. Epub 2008 Feb 3." 5. In order to define the test sample, you should describe chemical markers of test sample, for example, yield, UV absorbance of extract and/or content of total phenol compounds, in 2.1. 6. There were no dose responses in body weight gain, serum levels of glucose and ALT. Why did you use the dose 100, 150 and 200 mg/kg? You should describe the reason of dosage selection. 7. At line 161, you should revise to "and/or insulin resistances in diabetic animal models and clinical trials", because clinical trials have been conducted in Japan. 8. At line 175, normoglycaemic rats (group E): is it group F? Did test sample have a significant hypoglycaemic effect on normoglycaemic rats? If it is so, you should clearly describe the result and show a significant or insignificant difference. **9.** At line 188, "hepatocellular function-enhancing effect" should be revised to "hepatoprotective effect".	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. At line 10, "per kilogramme" should be revised to "for 4 weeks per kilogram". 2. At line 93, 94, 95 and 97, you should describe "Group X were treated with ******* after the injection of alloxan", and at line 96 and 98, you should add to "after the injection of no alloxan" 3. At line 110, "alkaline phosphatase" should be revised to "alkaline phosphatase (ALP)" 4. At line 135, 145 and 196. "the liver enzyme activities" should be revised to "serum levels of liver enzymes". 5. At line 170, alleviation of hypoglycaemia in diabetes: is it alleviation of hyperglycaemia in diabetes? 6. At line 182, "alkaline aminotransferase" should be revised to "alanine aminotransferase".	
Optional/General comments	This study demonstrated that the administration of aqueous extract of guava leaf for 4 weeks significantly reduced serum levels of ALT as well as glucose, and had no effects on serum levels of ALP and AST in alloxan induced diabetic rats. Results are clear. However, there are many incorrect and poor descriptions in the manuscript. Therefore, several revisions are necessary. There is a description that "all the animal processes involved in the handling and the experiment were carried out in accordance with the guideline of the Institution's Animal Ethical Committee". Is it sufficient?	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer