



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 Erythrophleum suaveolens 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	Abstract: Please download and use the approved format. See 'General Guideline for Authors'. Wrong conclusions are drawn as far as the results are concerned. Introduction: Page 1: Cited references should follow approved format:- References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [1] Left column:- 'Barstad et al, (1965)' should be cited as [1]. Others in the text should likewise be corrected, such as in page2. Please change: [3], [4], [5], [6] to [3 - 6]. Page 2 Left Par. 1. Please change [10], [11] - [15]. to [10 - 15]. Par 2 Second sentence of the paragraph may read: As a result, there is need for further confirmation of the blockade/inhibitory effect of cold water bark extract of <i>E. suaveolens</i> on other smooth muscles of the GIT [9].	Corrections complied with according to pointed guidelines.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1.1 Last sentence: 'This they also use in children'. Question is for what purpose? 2.1.2. Please follow 'General Guideline for Authors' when citing literatures. 2.1.2 Last sentence is wrong. 0.5g of extract dissolved in 5ml of distilled water gives a stock concentration of 1×10^{-1}g/ml and NOT 'stock concentration solution of 1×10^{-2}g/ml and 1×10^{-3}g/ml'. Please crosscheck your calculations. 2.2.1. Please state clearly what you mean by: 'Adult sized Wister strain rat sized rabbits (3.8-4.5kg' Define NEV first before using the abbreviation. Cite' Bulbring (1946)' with proper notation. 3.Results:According to General Guideline for Authors, 'Results should be clearly described in a concise manner. Results for different parameters should be described under subheadings or in separate paragraph. Table or figure numbers should be mentioned in parentheses for better understanding' In addition, Figures 1, 2 and 3 are representative tracings from your work. To generate a Log. dose-Response curve, get the mean $\pm$ SEM of four to five readings from each dose, with a total of 8 to 10 doses and generate the curves. Then read from the graph the dose-dependent inhibitory effects of extract and the drugs or otherwise. Only then can you properly discuss your findings. Fig. 1: Compare height of contractions of extract at 0.1ml and at 0.8ml. Comments please. 4. Discussion	Corrections complied with according to pointed guidelines.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Please note that you have only stated the results of your work. Transfer these write-ups to Results section, then start the discussion afresh. You should be able to put scientific meaning to your results. 4.1: Please change:- <i>E. suaveolens</i> on extract to '<i>E. suaveolens</i> extract' 5. Conclusion: The conclusion of comparing the relaxant potency or effect of extract with pancuronium is misleading. No statistics to that assertion from your results or discussion. References; Some of the cited literatures are not listed in the reference section.	Corrections complied with according to pointed guidelines.
Minor REVISION comments	Carry out phytochemical screening of the plant drug in order to ascertain the pharmacological active principles.	Phytochemical analysis forms part of our proposed second stage of this work.
Optional/General comments	The results are incomplete, not analyzed and the discussion is lacking.	Done as required.