

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83761
Title of the Manuscript:	A Screening on the Type I Anti-Diabetic Activity of the Methanolic Extract of Aegle Marmelos in Streptozotocin Induced Rat Model
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This paper explores the acute toxicity and anti-type 1 diabetes effect of methanol extract of Aegle Marmelos. The results showed that Aegle Marmelos methanol extract had good safety and anti-type 1 diabetes effect, but there were the following shortcomings:</p> <p>1. the article writing language requires a larger increase, such as the title can lead to misunderstanding, the author just tested the toxicity and anti-inflammatory effects of diabetes, and didn't see anything related to drug screening process, and in the title:The correct sentence should be “Anti Type I Diabetic Activity of the Methanolic Extract of Aegle Marmelos On Streptozotocin Induced Diabetic Rat Model”,But not “Type I Anti-Diabetic Activity”, or “Streptozotocin Induced Rat Model”.Therefore, the writing part of the whole article needs to be revised by professionals familiar with English.</p> <p>2. Some key data were missing, such as the result of the Histology of Pancreas tissue, which is the most important data directly related to type 1 diabetes and cannot be missing.</p> <p>3. “DM has emerged as the 0.33 greatest “killer” after cancer and cardio, ”-----Are there something wrong in this sentence?</p> <p>4. “Each 100gm powder was subjected to extraction with 1000ml methanol in a reflux condenser for 3 cycles -----100gm?---what `s the meaning?</p> <p>5. “Female Albino mice weighing between 25-35gm for toxicity”-----25-35gm?</p> <p>6. Female Albino mice weighing between 25-35gm for toxicity-----Mice have excessive body weight variability. The age of the mice also needs to be informed.</p> <p>7. “2.4.1 Acute oral toxicity study:”-----Information on the dose and volume administered should be clearly provided.</p> <p>8. “FBS >180 mg/dL”-----Abbreviations should be written in full when they first appear.</p> <p>9. In toxicity test, in addition to fatality index, animal activity state, appearance description, as well as organ index and other simple indicators should be added.</p> <p>10. The abscissa in Figure 3, 4,5 is incorrect , The abscissa should be divided into three indicators, each of which is divided into five groups, so that the figure will be more intuitive and clear.</p>	<p>Reviewer’s comments have been addressed and corrected. Kindly review it again.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Taken IAEC permission and Reg. Number was: 1564/PO/Re/S/11/CPCSEA</p>