

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81266
Title of the Manuscript:	DPP-4 INHIBITORS - AN OVERVIEW OF THE COMBINATION OF THESE MOLECULES AND HYPOGLICEMIC ORAL DRUGS
Type of the Article	REVIEW

### 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ The introduction needs to be rearranged and merged as pointed out in the manuscript. The paragraphs are disoriented and thus make it confusing to follow.</li><li>❖ If the authors focused on researches that were carried out between 2002-2021, why then is the manuscript limited to work between 2006-2013 and 2007-2014?. What happens between 2002-2005 and 2014-2021?</li><li>❖ The authors mentioned the work of Muskiet and collaborators with no duration of the work and where it was carried out.</li><li>❖ Results and discussion are satisfactory based on the study outline</li><li>❖ Conclusions are satisfactory based on the results presented</li><li>❖ References need to be corrected to meet the standard of the journal as pointed out in the manuscript.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We corrected all the indicated mistakes</li><li>• We searched for the trials between 2002-2021, then decided that the researches that were carried out between 2006-2013 and 2007-2014 are the most conclusive.</li><li>• The work of Muskiet took 8 weeks</li><li>• We corrected the references as indicated.</li></ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ There are lots of grammatical errors.</li><li>❖ The abstract is satisfactorily written.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We corrected the errors.</li></ul>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ Generally, the manuscript is shallow with no in-depth information.</li></ul>	

### **PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	