



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>)

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	There are so many grammatical and spelling errors in this work. Some SI Units were not written properly. Foreexample: "80°" should be written "80°C". See line four under abstract section. "diiferent" should be "different"(line 6 of abstract section). "mL " should be written "ml". "Health" not "heath". I have highlighted most of the errors in red. The author should give this work to somebody that is more proficient in this field to edit for him.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Writ-up is poor and not well formatted.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dike Charles Chijioko
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria