



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_45788
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALGESIC AND ANTIINFLAMMATORY ACTIVITY OF TOTAL ETHEREAL LEAF EXTRACT FRACTIONS OF ANNONA SENEGALENSIS PERS. (ANNONACEAE)
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the sections of the paper having large number of grammatical and technical errors. 2. Introduction- Paragraph 1&2, 3&4 and 4&6 to be combined, respectively. 3. Experimental Procedure: The extraction and fractionation procedure were not clearly explained in the paper. Need to extend further, especially how fractions F1, F2, F3, F4 and FS were obtained. 4. How the dose was selected for anti-inflammatory study? Have you done acute toxicity study? If yes, need to be explained in the paper. 5. Why F5 is not included in anti-inflammatory study? Any reason? 6. Why only F4 was selected for Phospholipase A2 inhibition assay & Acetic acid induced writhing in mice studies. The reason of selection to be included in the paper. 7. Results – There were many paragraphs in the results part with subtitle, it is really confuse the readers, need to be combined with one subtitle as Carrageenan Induced anti-inflammatory activity of.....No proper compilation was done. 8. Phytochemical study need to be explained in the results instead of results shown in Table 1. 9. Figure 3 & 4 need to be combined as one Figure to compare the results of F1, F2, F3, F4 & F5. 	
Minor REVISION comments	--	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahendran Sekar
Department, University & Country	Universiti Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia