



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_36766
Title of the Manuscript:	Zanthoxylum species in Uganda: a novel wound healing alternative
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	<p>This is quite interesting study. Before going to further process author need to address the followings,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In the manuscript I could not find any mechanism of action or proof of collagen produced by Plant X 2) The author should identify Plant specimen using DNA barcode method, it is necessary to authenticate herbal product 3) I could not find any NMR or MS studies in the manuscript 4) Rewrite Introduction..... 5) Plant voucher number or authenticated by whom? 6) Why author should go with aqueous extraction? The way of extraction is not proper 7) Dissolving 5g in 100mls of its extraction solvent....is it correct statement? 8) Excision wounds were created on the barks of rats....is it correct statement? 9) How the author applied the fraction on topical mode? 10) How the author conclude Presence (+) absent (-) Abundant (++) of phytochemicals? 11) Provide statistical significance of ppercentage wound reduction 12) What is the reason author giving structure of compounds from previous report? 13) Discussion should be rewrite 14) Wound healing mechanisms that mimic stem cell stimulation.... is it correct statement? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Section 2.5 in the methodology has been added to described the method for collagen detection. Production of collagen is evidenced by observation of the blue color as shown in the figures 1-3, Collagen fibers are known to stain blue with Trichrome stain. The intensity of the blue color which was higher in Plant X group correlates with the amount of collagen produced. 2) The Identity of the plant was concealed because the herbalist did not grant us permission to do till his product is patented. A statement to that effect has been added in section 1.0 line 53 3) The identification of the 5 alkaloids was performed at Wits University – South Africa using HPLC and LC- MS, but we did not receive all the information including the spectrum and the like, so we have decided to remove the structures from the paper to avoid obvious questions that will arise especially on structure determination 4) IntroductionModifications has been done in the introduction section indicated by yellow highlights 5) Plant authentication was done by University Botanist and voucher specimen Patrick 001 deposited at the department of pharmacy for future referencethis has been added in section 1.0 lines 54-56. 6) The method of extraction description has been corrected---it was serial extraction as now described in section 2 lines was not as described, the powder was first extracted in Petroleum ether using soxhlet extraction method, followed by ethanol and lastly distilled water (in increasing polarity). The details are clearly corrected in the revised copy. 7) This has been properly described 8) Spelling error, we meant “back” not “bark”. That has been corrected 9) After reconstituting the dry extracts in their corresponding solvents, the solution was applied by dropping to cover the entire wound surface using a dropper twice daily for 15 days...this has been described in the manuscript section 2 lines 105 to 107. 10) A detailed description has been added in section 2.3 11) That was provided 12) These molecules were detected in the plant extract as explained in the procedure added. Knowing that they are present in this plant may guide further research on identifying the specific phytochemicals responsible for the observed wound healing effect. 13) Discussion has been improved 14) Stem cell stimulationstatement removed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		