



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_60494
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF TOAD PAROTID GLAND SECRETION FROM INDIAN TOAD (BUFO MELANOSTICTUS) IN DIABETIC RATS: AN EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE OF P-GLYCOPROTEIN INHIBITION
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the description of the biological activity of these natural products, what are they? I suggest that you describe the main ones, and together with a figure of the structures, this gives the idea of which secondary metabolites are responsible for the activities presented in the manuscript. Additionally, what are the peptides, steroidal alkaloids?</p> <p>Additionally, I found this way of study very interesting. But, the structure of what is described as an image would make it visually better to interpret.</p> <p>This part is a mess, I believe it needs to be described in another way. What were the size / diameter of the column used? I found it confusing when describing 5 microns, is it related to the particle diameter of C18? And when the flow of the mobile phase, which was used? And as for the solvent system, several solvents were described at the beginning of this topic, but I did not find anything related to the proportion of the solvents, was the method carried out in the isocratic or exploratory gradient?</p> <p>The LC HRMS part is well described.</p> <p>The spectra have a bad resolution, you cannot see the m/z values. I suggest that you present other figures with better resolution.</p> <p>The rest of the topics as results are well written.</p> <p>Only, I believe that there should be an improvement in the discussion of the spectrum data, as well as the m / z values obtained.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I congratulate the authors for the research, especially since it was not funded by anybody. I left some suggestions for improving the manuscript described above.</p>	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cristhian Santos Oliveira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Paraná, Brazil