



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_67976
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF B-AESCIN EFFECT IN STREPTOZOTOCIN INDUCED DIABETIC MODEL: DIABETIC HEPATOTOXICITY STUDY
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript ID <b>Ms_JPRI_67976</b>: "ASSESSMENT OF B-AESCIN EFFECT IN STREPTOZOTOCIN INDUCED DIABETIC MODEL: DIABETIC HEPATOTOXICITY STUDY" is an interesting article and I think that this paper shall be of interest for pharmaceutical biologists.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The authors focused on the hepatoprotective effect of <math>\beta</math>- aescin as appeared in the title and the results. However, diabetic mice treated with <math>\beta</math>- aescin showed decreased blood glucose levels with emphasis on the high dose at 3.6 mg/kg that reached comparable levels with that of the glibenclamide administered group. These findings should be highlighted indicating a potential anti-diabetic effect of <math>\beta</math>- aescin.</b></li> <li><b>The same previous approach should be considered when discussing the inhibitory action on ROS generation indicating a potential anti-oxidant effect of <math>\beta</math>- aescin.</b></li> <li><b>The authors compared the results of treated groups after induction of diabetes with the normal healthy group. Therefore, when stating that there was a significant difference in serum biochemical parameters between treated groups with <math>\beta</math>- aescin or the standard drug (glibenclamide) when compared to the normal healthy untreated group (G1), the reader may conclude that <math>\beta</math>- aescin failed to restore the normal levels of these biochemical parameters and consequently, may think that <math>\beta</math>- aescin has no hepatoprotective effect. So, the comparison between the treated groups and STZ control group (G2) will have much more reasonable sound to highlight the hepatoprotective effect of <math>\beta</math>- aescin.</b></li> <li><b>Other comments are highlighted with yellow colour in the manuscript file.</b></li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript is full of typo mistakes and should be revised for proper language because grammatical errors were observed.</li> <li>The references cited within the text are not given ascending numbers according to their position in the text as the first mentioned reference must have lower numbers.</li> <li>In addition, most of the abbreviations mentioned without their full meaning specially when they are mentioned for the first time.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sherif Mahmoud Mohamed Afifi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Sadat City, Egypt</b>