



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_45419
Title of the Manuscript:	Gastrointestinal Tract Effects of Aqueous Stem Bark Extract of Citrus aurantifolia
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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>Line 1: Title – Consider “effect of aqueous stem bark extract of citrus aurantifolia on the gastrointestinal tract of rats”</p> <p>Line 18: Abstract – faeces - NOT feces</p> <p>Line 28: Add one more important word to the keywords</p> <p>Line 32: Should be - “adult’s daily stool”</p> <p>Line 39: Should be - “nowadays” - NOT now a days</p> <p>Line 42: “rehydration” NOT- dehydration</p> <p>Line 76: “twenty one” NOT – twenty -one</p> <p>Line 78: “72 hours” NOT 72-hours</p> <p>Line 1:</p> <p>Line 90: Consider -“All rats were each housed in a cage...”</p> <p>Line 91: Should be - “1 hour after.....”</p> <p>Line 92: Consider - “6 hours and the number of spots with watery faeces on the white ”</p> <p>Line 100: should be “Chitme et al.”</p> <p>Line 105: Should be - “30 minutes later”</p> <p>Line 109: Should be “Robert et al.”</p> <p>Line 110: “ overnight” DELETE “f”</p> <p>Line 114: should be “1 hour post”</p> <p>Line 136: should be “6 hours of”</p> <p>Line 146: should be “(6 hrs)” ALSO “percentage protection (%)”</p> <p>Lines 188 - 192: Not necessary as protocol not explicit and no table to show this in the results.</p> <p>Lines 195 - 196: How did you ascertain the release of prostaglandin (PGE2α)?</p> <p>Line 205: Consider – “Study also showed that C. Aurantifolia” INSTEAD OF “In</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>this study,” this is repeatedly used.</p> <p>NOTE:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is need to refer to your tables as you discuss your results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The table for the toxicity study-results should be referred to or else, this is not necessary in the discussion.</p> <p>Line 228: The phrase “posses significant ...” SHOULD BE HIGHLIGHTED REFERENCE TO RESULTS AND STATISTICAL OUTCOME.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article is based on rigorous academic standards. • Good methodology and technical quality. 	

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:	Ogundeko, Timothy Olugbenga
Department, University & Country	Bingham University, Karu, Nigeria