



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Ok</p> <p>What is the meaning of "I.P"? This should not be abbreviated in the abstract. Or rather give full meaning followed by abbreviation.</p> <p>Introduction Poorly written and not convincing. A number of sentences are unclear and without reference e.g. Line 22-24: "They have be noted common human affliction from the down history. The exact incident in population of developing countries has not been determined but in spite of ascertain to the contrary". This statement is unclear in its meaning and also not referenced. Line 25-28 also not referenced Line 30-37 needs to be rewritten. Too much focus on explaining the pathophysiology of the disease. What are the symptoms and health implications associated with the disease? What is the statistical prevalence on the current disease? Why did the author embark on this research? What is his aim and objective? Answers should be provided for these pertinent questions. In all the introduction there are only three references. More relevant papers should be referenced. Also reference 3 did not have the information for which it is referred for. Author should ensure the reference used for any statement can be substantiated.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Plant Collection and Identification</p> <p>Line 43: the voucher number should be included Line 44-49: this paragraph should not be in this section. It can be included to the introduction after some editing and properly referenced.</p> <p>Preparation and Extraction of Plant Materials Ok</p> <p>Grouping of Swiss albino rats This section is not necessary, should be deleted. The Information in this section was also mentioned in the “evaluation of anti-hemorrhoid....” section.</p> <p>Experimental protocol Line 71: “The first set was used to improve an existing Experimental model of haemorrhoids mentioned by [3]” how was the model improved? The name of the cited reference should be included in this case. Line 72: “AL, and a combination of both extracts.” What is AL? The full meaning was not given and which extracts was combined?</p> <p>Line 83: mention the full meaning of KEP here or earlier in and why did you use a different dose for KEP (400 mg/kg) as oppose to other groups (200mg/kg).</p> <p>Line 84-85: by applying croton oil preparation.” Croton oil or jatropa oil? The section heading said jatropa. Please clarify.</p> <p>Results: Line 100: “Table 2: Effect of Jatropa oil on the body weights of mice before and after induction”. This was not mentioned in the method section. When was the body weight taken after induction? Immediately or later.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>What is the time interval? Histology diagrams should be elaborated and some important structures should be pointed with labels. Discussion Ok</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Some choice of words used should be changed e.g Line14 "<i>the best</i>" - highest Line 65 "received humane care" –taken cared of Line 115 "well proved" - well proven Line 135 "greatest" – highest Spacing should be made where appropriate e.g Line 6 "<i>four(4)</i>" – four (4) Line13 "<i>KEP(mixture)</i>" – KEP (mixture Line64 "1985(Public" – 1985 (Public Line 82 "(10mg/kg)" – (10 mg/kg).... And many more</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript can be accepted after these major revisions. The English writing is poor and needs to be improved. Some corrections have been highlighted in the PDF file.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Idris Bello</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Pharmacology and toxicology, School of pharmaceutical sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia</i>