



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_25433
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-hemorrhoid Evaluation of Selected Medicinal plants used in North-East Nigeria for the Treatment of Hemorrhoids (Pile)
Type of the Article	Research

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There lacked a negative control group when estimating the effect of the plant medicines on the induced haemorrhoid. 2. The authors did not present the results for the experiment "quantifying the extent of plasma exudation and dermining the levels of inflammatory cytokines such as TNF-α and IL-6 associated with haemorrhoids". 3. In the section of "Material and Methods", the authors said "Histological observation of the rectoanal tissue was carried to determine the appearance of inflammatory cells, congestion, haemorrhage, vasodilatation, and medium to high degrees of necrosis", but in the section of "Results", only the microscopic images of the rectoanal tissues of the model mice and the mice treated with Anogeissus leiocarpus were displayed, and no marker was given relevant to inflammatory cells, congestion, haemorrhage, vasodilatation, and necrosis. 4. In line 127 , there was the sentence "The normal control group showed normal cell architecture of the rectoanal region.", but there had no normal control group in the experimental protocols and no microscopic images for normal control in the results. 5. There were a lot of expression confused, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) In line 84, there is "normal control group", but in the experiment evaluating anti-haemorrhoid property of the plant medicines, there were only 5 group (in line 81), the positive control group and the other four tested groups. (2) In lines 81-82, group 5 received pilex granule (PG) (10 mg/kg b.w.), but in table 3, it is group 1 received PG (5 	CORRECTIONS MADE



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>mg/kg b.w.).</p> <p>(3) The tested extracts were administrated to the mice by i.p., but how was PG administrated to the mice? And how were the extracted prepared ?</p> <p>(4) When were the mice weighed after haemorrhoid-induction with Jatropha oil to obtain the data shown in table 2?</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>There were many printing mistakes in the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In line 6, there is “four (4) selected plants were screened”, but there were six plants mentioned later. 2. In line 10, was induced in “group of five mice of five animals per group” 3. In line 21, “of the vessel of the superior of inferior rectal” 4. In line 66-67, “by committees for the purpose of control and supervision of control and supervision of experiments on animals” 5. In line 80, “were randomized based on their body weights and were divided into” 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>This manuscript was prepared roughly. The experimental design had apparent defect and the data were unbelievable.</p>	