Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI-77027
Title of the Manuscript:	Ginsenoside Re, produces multi-targeted potent antidiabetic effects via estrogen receptor signaling pathway in rat, an alternative multi-targeted therapeutic for type 2 diabetes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

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		, in the second
	Author should mention ethical clearance number	
	Author Why not measure estrogn level "your findings mostly compared with estrogen signalling path way	
	3. Why you used female Sprague dawley rats and clarify that	
	4. Author used standard drug as rasiglitazone that serve as insulin sensitizer	
	Why not asses insulin sensitivity indices and add it	
	 5. Authur why not study estrogens receptor and mention weather extracellular memberan receptor and nuclear receptor in respect part. 6. Previously reported that panaxadiols and penaxatriol has been toxic chemical substance to animals (SE CHEN ET AL 1980, Eur j drug metab pharmakinetics) to avoid potential toxicity risk	
Minor REVISION comments		
_		
Optional/General comments		

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. Saravanan
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)