

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_128506
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of the pharmacological properties of Dichrostachys cinerea hydroalcoholic extract on the contractility of taenia coli isolated from guinea pigs
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There have been ample studies on this plant before as suggested by the literature review. The current study is just the validation of the laxative property of Dichrostachys cinerea as per available data on the phytoconstituents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The word "Evaluation" is suggested rather than "Study" in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	There are few suggestions that are recommended in the abstract. Please see the comments in abstract part of the manuscript.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The methodology of the manuscript is largely correct and needs little modification. The scientific techniques that were used are accurate and proven from the literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is a serious problem in the references of the manuscript. There is a lot of information in the introduction part that devoid any reference. Moreover, one reference is being used multiple times. That should be avoided.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a need of improving English language in the manuscript. A help from Grammarly app can be taken for this purpose to refine the language.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed Umer Sohaib
Department, University & Country	Superior University, Pakistan