



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	

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line No. 4 –‘It ‘ to be changed to ‘Its’. No. 21 – 25: To be rewritten with grammatical correctness. No. 27- To be corrected as ‘Heredity’, ‘sex and pregnancy’. No. 28 –‘Diarrhoea’ (Sp.) No. 29-30 – The statement lacks clarity - has to be reconstructed No.32-‘Delete ‘The’ No. 35- 37 – The statement lacks clarity - has to be reconstructed No.44- Change to ‘Rectum’ No.45- 46- Reconstruct the sentences as - ‘using different plant species as concoction, decoction and macerated parts.’ No. 46- 48- Delete the sentence starting from ‘ This research....antihemorroid properties’ (Since it is already mentioned as the objective) No. 48 – 49- The highlighted part should be reconstructed because clarity is lacking in the statement. No.52 – To be changed to ‘ ‘Aqous plant extract was prepared for..& other plant extracts were prepared using.....’. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research value of the paper is very good. The authors need to take care of the grammatical correctness of the sentences Usually in ‘Discussion’, the references of the related work get figured . Here nothing has been mentioned about it. <p>So, the authors have to relate their present research with the earlier related works done in the field</p>
		ALL COMMENTS TAKEN AND CORRECTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. 56 – to be changed to.. ‘5 each in accordance with the 5 test groups.’ • No. 66- 67 – Remove the repeated words which are highlighted. • No. 74 – insert ‘Which are’ at the highlighted region • No. 93 – Add ‘out’ at the highlighted part • No.98 – In Table 1-‘Put dot after ‘No’ • No. 115- Remove ‘a’ • No. 129- Delete ‘s’. • No. 132 -133 – The highlighted portion may be deleted. • No. 134- Remove ‘a’ • No.137 – Rewrite as ‘Ingredients’ • No. 139- Rewrite as ‘Possess’ • No. 140- ‘Used’ • No. 141 – ‘Conventional ‘ is a better word than ‘Orthodox’ • No. 142 –Rewrite as ‘..which is normally....’ <p>In Discussion, none of the references mentioned at the end of the manuscript are figuring.</p>		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>No. 48 – 49 – Something about the <u>‘Study of Ecology & method of preparation of drug’</u> are mentioned the explanation of which do not figure anywhere in the text .</p> <p>Please clarify</p>		
Optional/General comments	<p>The topic is good. But needs a lot of corrections before publishing , as mentioned above.</p>		