SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_JAMPS_13779**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Phytochemical screening and polyphenolic contents of Dialium dinklagei and Diospyros monbuttensis, two Ivorian medicinal plants used to treat malaria**
Type of the Article	**Short Research Articles**

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** *(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 submission represents a contribution to our knowledge about the phytochemical composition of two medicinal plant species. However, I found some serious weaknesses, which must be corrected to improve the quality of the paper. 1) The submission cannot read and understand without difficulty. The authors are encouraged to rewrite specially the materials and methods section to improve clarity. 2) Some phenological information about the species sampled should be given (if adult plants, flowering plants, or bearing fruits plants, etc., were analyzed) because the synthesis and accumulation of phenols and any other metabolites in plant tissues are season and age dependent. Details of any of those aspects might affect the phenol composition of plant tissues. 3) Voucher specimens of each plant species sampled must be collected and the Herbarium where the vouchers were deposited must be also mentioned. 4) It is necessary to specify details of how the samples were formed, indicating if one, ten, or more individuals were sampled, that is important in order to take in account the natural variability of populations. Details about any sub-sampling prior to analysis and the number of independent samples that were analyzed also must be given; one pooled sample analyzed in triplicate does not constitute an adequate sample design, "n" = 3 means that three independent samples were analyzed, not that one sample was analyzed in triplicate. The authors are encouraged to be sure that this represents your actual experimental design. 5) Authors are encouraged to mention the proper test revealing the different classes of compounds present in the extracts.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	6) Table 1 should be eliminated, part of the information contained was already mentioned in the "Plant material" section and all the information of the Table could be mentioned in the same section. 7) Please, in Figure 1 indicate the units of extract yields. The number of independent samples analyzed and statistical parameters (appropriate error bars) must be clearly defined. 8) Please, check the value of tannin contents shown in page 7, line 250 with those shown in Table 3. Also define the mean discrimination test used, Tukey (as mentioned on page 4, line 153) or Dunnett (as mentioned on page 7, line 255). 8) Please, check the statement of page 8, line 274 about "Tannins are an important source of protein in animals …". Tannins are not proteins. 9) Please, check that the manuscript conforms with all journal requirements concerning the references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Norma Almaraz Abarca**
Department, University & Country	**Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México**