



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>Author must include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attempt by previous researchers to correct this situation using plants or other sources of medication 2. What gap is left to be filled by researchers like the author 3. Why the need to explore the potency of these plants in correcting the mentioned disease condition? 4. What considerations were made in the selection of these plants? 5. What are some folkloric uses of these plants? 6. The concentration and the type of plant extract for group IV 7. Why the use of Jatropha oil? 8. Author should explain why different dosages/concentrations prepared for different plants. 9. Why one of the preparations KEP consisted of three different plants? It is difficult to conclude that <i>Khaya senegalensis</i>, <i>Euphorbia hirta</i>, <i>Parkia biglobosa</i> possess antihemorrhoid properties when they were not tried individually. 10. Author must clearly state the objective for this research. Words such as "also the ecology, scientific names and method of preparation of the drug and also to make a herbarium press of the plant species" that 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>appeared under materials and method are not appropriate and measurable.</p> <p>11. Which oil was used for the inducement? Croton or Jatropha? Both were mentioned to have been used.</p> <p>12. If Jatropha oil has that property and has been used why was other treatment prepared in Jatropha?</p> <p>13. If Croton oil was for the inducement, where is the control?</p> <p>Results must be explained briefly.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Material and method:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 44-49: The information here has nothing to do about materials and method. This was an attempt to state the problem necessitating undertaking the research. Author must cut this and paste at introduction with much revision. 2. Line 52-53: Author should justify why the water was used to extract one of the plants instead of absolute ethanol used on the others. 3. Line 75: What does AL stands for? Which plants were combined? 4. Author must be specific about the number of plant species used in the experiment. There is inconsistency. Four plants were stated in the abstract. However, 5 and 6 were listed in the introduction and experimental respectively. 5. Who is Mr. Cletus? State his profession. 6. No description in the text under experimental about the use of Jatropha oil to determine the body weights of animals. 7. Table 1 bears wrong heading/caption; what is table 1 about? 8. All figures and tables must be mentioned in the test. 9. Tables and figures must come after they have been mentioned in the test (discussion). 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide clearly defined problem, proposed solution, and the scope and justification of the work done in your introduction. 2. Language poorly constructed and must be revisited. See Line 22-23, 33 etc. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. All aspects of the experimental must be clearly described unless existing protocols have been used.4. Avoid repetition of words: see line 665. Author must be consistent in the usage of some words eg. Anti-hemorrhoid.6. Discussion of results must be extensively done.7. Introduction is too shallow.8. The discussion about the tables and figures should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures. No tables or figures should be given without discussion or reference inside the text.9. Author must consider the referencing sstyle of the Journal: See an example- Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. <p>Paper can be accepted for publication after the concerns have been addressed.</p>	
--	---	--

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Victor Y. A. Barku</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Chemistry, University of Cape Coast, Ghana</i>