



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_45717
Title of the Manuscript:	Polyphenol content and antioxidant activity of bark hydroethanolic extract of Piliostigma reticulatum (DC) Hochst and its fractions
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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. English is very poor in the whole manuscript; it need to be rewrite again.</p> <p>2. Introduction part should contain detail information related to your research but you have given only few previous studies of your plants which indicates lack of total information regarding this studies. Please have a look on references, which will help you how to elaborate introduction or background.</p> <p>3. How did you choose this dose? As we know that there is chance toxicity in crude extract as it contains many compounds some are more or less toxic, to make sure you should have to perform toxicity test.</p> <p>3. There are so many problems with symbol such, mn, ABTS+•, what does it indicate?</p> <p>4. Results need to be rewrite again by following the previous studies</p> <p>5. Discussion should contain detail evidences related to polyphenol, Antioxidant activity and Ferric Reducing Antioxidant Power assay.</p> <p>6. Mechanism of action is not cleared in the discussion.</p> <p>7. Please have look on below references which will help you to rewrite or correct your paper.</p> <p>References: -</p> <p>a. Investigation of Antioxidant and Cytotoxic Activities of Methanolic Extract from Curculigo recurvata Leaves</p> <p>b. Ex-vivo cytotoxic, antibacterial and DPPH free radical scavenging assay with ethanolic leaf extract of Glycosmis pentaphylla to justify its traditional use</p> <p>c. Evaluation of Thrombolytic and Cytotoxic activities of an Ornamental medicinal plant: Byttneria pilosa</p> <p>d. Anti-Inflammatory and Anti-Oxidant Study of Ethanolic Extract of Mimosa pudica</p> <p>e. Potential investigation of anti-inflammatory and anti-oxidative property of ethanolic extract of Ixora nigricans leaves</p> <p>f. Evaluation of antimicrobial and cytotoxic activity of Lentinus edodes (Shiitake Mushroom) cultivated in Bangladesh</p> <p>g. In vitro Investigation of Antimicrobial, Antitumor and DPPH Reduction Capacity of the Methanolic Extract of Scoparia dulcis</p> <p>h. Ealuation of cytotoxic and ex-vivo cardioprotective investigation of ethanolic extract of glycosmis pentaphylla leaves</p>	<p>1-I tried to improve it</p> <p>2- It was a recommendation of my head of laboratory to be short in the introduction, but I took it back. Thank for the references</p> <p>3- Acute toxicity test is planned. the dose was chosen following a series of dose / effect tests according to the substrate used and the reading wavelengths.</p> <p>3- It's corrected in the text</p> <p>4- We don't compare the results on this part but rather in the discussion and it was done</p> <p>5- FRAP test is an antioxidant test and the link between polyphenol content and antioxidant activity of compounds has been discussed.</p> <p>6- in our laboratory, mechanisms of action are not detailed in the articles but rather in a thesis or memory.</p> <p>7- thanks for the references, it helped me a lot</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Plant materials and Extraction is not clear; it should be scientific.</p>	<p>1- not very understand what you want mean. Isn't scientific? Be more specific please.</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>2. Why did not you use random dose instead of 250 - 125 - 62.5 - 31.25 - 15.62 - 7.81, suppose dose 7.81 <math>\mu\text{g}</math> / ml is effective compare to other, then how will you prepare if you need to prepare only one dose???</p> <p>3. Figure 1: Y-axis should contain number to present in mg.</p> <p>4. Same word has been used many times, too poor.</p>	<p>2- see answer two</p> <p>3- numbers are added</p> <p>4- Well noted, i tried to improve it</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>5. I would suggest you change the figure formats</p> <p>6. if you have raw data please present your results in the table</p>	we cannot present the results in table and figure at the same time. Here we choose figure. In others, it's table which is used.

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>It is not animal studies, so I do not think, Ethical approval is important for this paper but Plant herbarium number is required.</p>	