



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47396
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the effect of vaginal capsule of evening primrose oil and misoprostol on cervical ripening of nulliparous women with post-term pregnancy: A clinical Trial
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>

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>The theme dealt here is very important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: Delete the first sentence of "Pregnancy is a new and unique situation (Babanazari, 2017)." These "common sense" should not be described in a scientific paper. These words sound as if the authors say that ordinary readers may not know these things. Two words appear indicating the same thing: post term and prolonged pregnancy. Usually we use the former. Be consistent. "The most common cause of pregnancy" should be "post-term pregnancy". These careless mistakes are present here and there. To point out these kinds of errors IS NOT reviewer's job. Hereafter I will not point out these kind of mistakes and thus please completely check all the manuscript. English should be revised. Please ask some linguist to edit English. 2. Materials: "normal heart embolism pattern": what is this? 500-mg capsule of evening primrose oil was administered. How did you determine this dose? Please cite references. If this was your own strategy, please describe its rationale. 3. Findings: "3441.53" should be "3441": this holds true to all numbers and variables. Table 1 should indicate study vs. control group similar to Table 2 and 3. No use to indicate backgrounds of "all" women. Table 2 and 3 are identical. Delete one. Figure 1: "what was measured" is not written in both X and Y-axis. "Bishop score" and "time" should be described here. 4. Introduction is too long compared "what was demonstrated here". Shorten the Introduction. 5. Induction labor should be evaluated fundamentally if "labor induction succeeded" and the increased Bishop score is ONLY a surrogate marker. Even if one has gained increased Bishop score by this method, whether induction labor was actually obtained is much more important. You can very easily obtain the following data: 1) if vaginal delivery was actually done or cesarean was required (induction success rate and cesarean rate), 2) induction-delivery time, 3) if all continued to stay in hospital or if some go back to one's home without initiation of labor, 4) Apgar score. At least to test if your strategy was effective to "induce labor onset" (and not simply increase Bishop score), these four are mandatory. Compare these four between study vs. control group and then discuss that your strategy is right. More simply, "good Bishop but failure of induction": you should definitely "deny" this scenario. If you do not have data and insist to claim the present context, then, please definitely state, 1) why you did not show these data, and 2) even without these four data you CAN say that this strategy is right (even though your data did not show if induction succeeded or not). Once again, Bishop is a surrogate endpoint! State your context definitely. <p>The theme is important. However, the study design is not good.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shigeki Matsubara
Department, University & Country	Jichi Medical University, Japan