SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/IJTDH/1693**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Anti-diabetic activity of aqueous extracts of *Vitexdoniana* leaves and *Cinchona calisaya* bark in alloxan – induced diabetic rats.**

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)

Comments
Title: 1. separate 'Vitexdoniana' into genus and species
2. Remove the full stop after title, and also after the titles in sections 3.3, 3.4, 4.0 etc

Abstract

- **Lines 6/7:** separate Vitexdoniana into genus and species, and also italicise Cinchona calisaya
  Authors must ensure they italicise all botanical names throughout the MS
- **Line 9:** indicate hydrated form of alloxan. It is unavailable as simply alloxan
- **Lines 9/11:** give doses as absolute figures rather than as 150.0, i.e delete ".0"
- **Line 11:** specify whether same doses of both plants were administered or not
- **Line 13:** 'at all tested doses' implied more than 2 doses which was not so. Authors should replace with "at both doses tested"
- **Lines 13/ 19:** ensure uniformity in expressing unit of dose(i.e. 50 mg/kg body wt)
- **Line 15:** 'after four days of daily injection'. I believe oral administration was employed. Then replace with "after four days of oral administration"
  Also separate 'whereas' from 'C. calisaya' and ensure same from abstract to end of text
- **Line 20:** results of antioxidant status should be summarised and included if relevant. Remove hyphen in anti-diabetes and anti-oxidant throughout the MS
- **Lines 21/22:** remove 'carbohydrates and tannins' as they are not secondary metabolites

Key words: line 24: replace 'antidiabetics' with 'antidiabetic activity'. Delete 'antioxidant' since no such report appeared in the abstract

Table 1: delete as it is too preliminary for inclusion. Only mention key findings

Section 3.5; separate title

Introduction: line 35: separate Iwu*et al*. See lines 43, 44, 119, 180 for similar separation of words and throughout the text where necessary
Lines 42/45: include authority of the 2 plants. Spelling of the family is wrong

Materials and methods
Line 67: include date of collection and voucher nos to reflect authentication. No mention of drying and grinding plants prior to extraction contrary to line 85
Line 81: use 'our study'
Line 85: use 500g

Line 91: replace with 'determination of effects on alloxan-induced diabetic rats'. After weighing animals, the next procedure is to divide them into groups say A to D for the purpose of administering extracts. The MS is thus deficient, and should be revised accordingly
The authors also failed to mention the reference for the procedure.
Line 100: remove square bracket before 'The....' in the next sentence and also in line 100.
Line 101: since a group of 5 animals has been mentioned in line 97, it needs not be repeated in line 101. Furthermore, the authors did not mention that they determined blood glucose after certain period of giving the extracts. This is a great omission.
Line 102: final strength of tween 80 used (i.e. %) was not mentioned.
Section 2.5 should be properly revised to accommodate several corrections mentioned.

Section 2.6.
Line 109: model of the spectrophotometer used should be mentioned
Line 113: close bracket after adrenaline
line 114: put full stop to end the sentence

section 2.7.
lines 117/ 127: use only one reference, preferably the recent one
lines 118/ 131: model of the spectrophotometer used should be mentioned, use upper case for 'uv'
line 120: write ph properly. The authors failed to include reference reagent used.
Merge the 2 paragraphs in this section.

Section 2.8
Line 136: end sentence with 'for the presence of secondary metabolites'

RESULTS
Line 139: change title to 'antidiabetic activity of extracts'
Line 145: remove 'see' from 'fig'

Fig 1: 'days' in the y-axis should be in lower case for uniformity. Do same for 'control' and 'glibenclamide' in the key, and also in the key for section 3.3.
C. calisaya at 50mg/kg was more active than at 100mg/kg b/w 2 and 4h. This anomaly should be explained.

Section 3.2
Line 153: don't pluralise hypoglycaemic agents
Line 154: last sentence cannot be justified since SOD activity increased with increased dosage of V. doniana, but reduce in the case of C. calisaya

Section 3.3
Merge the 2 paragraphs

Section 3.5
Line 182: deitalicise 'bark'

Table 1: delete

Discussion

SDI Review Form 1.5

Start sentence with 'Our investigation revealed significant decreases.....'
Line 205: continue with 'treated with doses of the extract of both plants.' Since only one extract was prepared
Line 208: continue with 'justifies their traditional use in the management of.....'
Line 210: at a lower dose
In this section, reference should be made to any published antidiabetic works on related species of Calisaya and Vitex if available
Line 227 delete 'through the action of alloxan' from the sentence
Line 229: remove 'seen'
Line 236: merge with previous sentence
Lines 240-243: the standard drug glibenclamide, inhibited catalase activity but the extracts increased it. How would the authors then justify antidiabetic claim
Line 246: delete from 'these.....of'
Lines 247-253: sentence is too long, revise
Line 259: delete 'table 1' and also delete it from list of figures and tables as earlier recommended
Line 263: Delete 'strong' since it cannot be sufficiently justified and end sentence at 'mellitus'. Then, start another sentence

SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)*
General comment:	The MS attempted to justify use of the 2 plants in diabetes therapy using relevant methodology including biochemical studies. The 2 doses employed and short duration of study (4 days) may not sufficiently justify long term usage. It is considered as a preliminary finding	
Specific comments:	As above	
Title and abstract	As above	
Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*	Problem is a common one, and the 2 plants may add to the list of local remedies	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	1) Recheck all as some were missing e.g. Aebi, 1984; Biye and Aust, 1978; EllnanWojitaszek et al, 2003. Authors should delete or substitute very old references where possible 2)one or two review articles may also help	
Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*	Methods appear ok, but check other comments above	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	1)ok 4) ok Check comments relevant above	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	Authors must specify	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	ok	
References		

SDI Review Form 1.5

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Adebayo Gbolade**
Department, University & Country	**Pharmacognosy, University of Benin, Nigeria**