



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</p> <p>“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</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Why not include a comparative table about the polyphenol content found in some other samples similar to this one?</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>The conclusions should be improved.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julian Cruz-Olivares
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of State of Mexico, Mexico