SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_IJBCRR_57725** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **PRELIMINARY ANTIDIABETIC POTENTIAL OF UGANDAN- MATOOKE (MUSA PARADISIACAL) PEELS** |
| Type of the Article | **Original 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | N/A | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | **1. Introduction:** I have observed that certain sentence was not referenced and are not your original ideas. Please do fix this and they are highlighted in the document.<br>**2. Materials and methods:** In your abstracts you mentioned that you have used 30 animals, but 2.4 it says 9 animals and 2.6 its 30 animals. The question is, how many animals have you used in total? Please ensure your abstract talks to total number of animals used.<br>**3.Results:** no comments<br>**4. Discussion:** brilliant discussion. The only minor observations are that an author has tendency in using 'we' and in science we use 3rd person. May I advise that this should be checkout in the enter document.<br>**5. Conclusion:** I have observed an author made two recommendations for example that banana should be peeled before usage. This wasn't not part of the study. However, if this was done on not published data please state that. In making recommendations on the work that was not done is confusing to a reader. | |
| **Optional/General** comments | N/A | |

**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)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Bongani Alphouse Nkala** |
| Department, University & Country | **Pearson Institute of Higher Education, South Africa** |