



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract "Material and Methods: Powdered barks were extracted with ethanol (80°)". 80° represents Celsius degrees or Ethanol content? ...different instead of "diiferent" I recommend writing the abstract in only one paragraph.</p> <p>Introduction The content of the introduction is very lack. Include a complete and recent state of the art of the topic.</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>Plant material. What kind of preservation method did you applied for the bark of <i>Piliostigma reticulatum</i> since it was collected in August 2015, until it was processed? What happened with the content of polyphenols during this time?</p> <p>Results: Why not include a comparative table about the polyphenol content found in some other samples similar to this one?</p> <p>Conclusions The conclusions should be improved.</p>	<p>80° represents Ethanol content. It's corrected in the text</p> <p>The author guideline recommended to divide the abstract at different sub-sections</p> <p>It was a recommendation of my head of laboratory, but I took it back</p> <p>Preservation condition is added in the text and this study has been started since 2016 and the polyphenol content was evaluated first. Another, the raw material was empty water during the preservation.</p> <p>We don't compare the results on this part but rather in the discussion and it was done</p>
Optional/General comments		

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>	