



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_50553
Title of the Manuscript:	Relaxant Activities of Extracts from Uvaria rufa Blume and Caesalpinia sappan L. on Excised Rat's Prostate Strips
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	This manuscript is good in its contents and composition, only needs a little improvement	Thank you for your reviews and comments.
Minor REVISION comments	The last word in the abstract should be Benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) At line 61 must be <i>Caesalpinia</i> not <i>Caesiapinia</i> At line 65 pulverized what size is the mesh At line 246 and 249 should be consistent with the above CEA, CEOH, UEA, UEOH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have already changed the last word in the abstract to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). - We have corrected <i>Caesalpinia</i> (line 61). - The range of the mesh is between 24 to 145 mesh. - We have already corrected the abbreviations at line 246 and 249 to CEA, CEOH, UEA and UEOH as we mentioned them previously.
Optional/General comments	There are 30 references (60%) that are not up to date (more than 10 years)	We have changed 18 references that they are up to date (2009-2019) (highlighted in yellow in the manuscript) and the content in the manuscript remains the same. However, we have not updated some of the references (8 ref.) because they were important (highlighted in pink in the manuscript, reference number 21,22,35,36,37,38, 49,50).

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>	Yes, there was an ethical issue in this manuscript. The details of animal ethics as follows: All of the animal procedure used in the present study were carried out in accordance with the reviewed and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee in the Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Chiang Mai University (ID: Re. 004/13).