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General comment

The title seems as if the authors have conducted an ethnobotanical survey of plants used in the treatment of diabetes of which there are just three plants in the study. The 2D structures of the compounds have to be generated using Chemdraw software so that the structures can be visible. The pictures from docking they are not very clear, can the authors get better pictures? The docking was performed on compounds from literature and not those isolated by the authors. Why was fractionation being carried out of which the fractions were not further purified? The reference has to follow the BMC style of referencing. The methodology has to be described in a consistent manner.

Abstract

Method:

Line 37: On the basis of results obtained, methanolic crude of extract of Cornus capitata Wall. was further sequentially fractionated in hexane, diethyl ether, ethyl acetate, n-butanol. This is not possible, except partitioning not maceration since ethanol is more polar than hexane.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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