



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_6529
Title of the Manuscript:	Fresh and decaying stem juice of <i>Musa acuminata x balbisiana</i> (<i>Musa paradisiaca</i>) reduce the force and rate of contractility of an isolated perfused rabbit heart
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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>The paper reports the ionotropic and chronotropic effect of <i>Musa acuminata</i> × <i>balbisiana</i> on the isolated perfused rabbit heart.</p> <p>The paper is well written, experimental part was well conducted and results were discussed appropriately. Therefore, I support the publication</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer