



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_14688
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATION OF RELAXATIVE EFFECT OF STEM-BARK EXTRACT OF <i>Erythrophleumsuaveolens</i> ON RAT PHRENIC NERVE-DIAPHRAGM MUSCLE
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/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	The manuscript lacks the data related to chemical standardisation (TLC, HPLC, HPLC/MS or HPLC/NMR fingerprints) is a substantial flaw. Standardization is required in order to assure reproducible pharmacological activity and efficacy of herbal preparations. The author wrote that Fig 2 showed the data of Suxamethonium and Fig 3 showed Pancuronium in discussion. Wasn't it mistake? The author suggested the performance of Erythrophleum suaveolens was similar to that of Pancuronium. Did they confirm that the effect of acetylcholine sterase inhibitor on Erythrophleum suaveolens?	Authors considered this as unnecessary addition at this stage, because, the study is to confirm the relaxant effect of E. suaveolens extract with the twitches of some reference drugs. Reviewer rightly pointed the error as there was a mix-up in the tracings from a concurrently going on research, thus corrections were effected. The performance of E. suaveolens was compared with that of Hexamethonium considering the twitches only. Hence, based on the salient observations of the reviewer above.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		