



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_21816
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Studies on the Phytochemical Properties of Five Nigerian Medicinal Plants
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	The manuscript titled "Comparative Studies on the Phytochemical Properties of Five Nigerian Medicinal Plants" reports some observation on composition with reference to five plants used for their medicinal properties. While the topic is interesting, there are some criticisms. The selection of these plants (excluding other as relevant as the chosen ones) should be explained and the scope of the work better addressed. The manuscript is poorly written and somehow confusing. All the experimental procedures must be detailed in the manuscript. With no experimental procedure described for quantitative analysis in full, the manuscript cannot be evaluated. Results in Table 2 must be detailed with numbers and ESD (see also Figure 1). How experimental data have been obtained? The analytical procedures (reagents, equipments, methodology, etc.) needs to be exploited in the experimental section of the manuscript. A list of chemical compounds (see discussion section) with literature reference is not necessary since the article is not a review. Results and discussion section should be re written not in form of a list of compounds with literature reference. Conclusions need to be re written addressing the scope of the manuscript and the results with a perspective rationale of possible future use of selected plants as medicinal plants. Literature list can be reduced. Finally, english spell/grammar revision is needed (see e.g. "time immemorial", or "Stvart Orbital Shaker" vs "Stuart Orbital Shaker", etc.).	Noted. Thanks for your review. Scope restructured and reason for selection included in the last paragraph of the introduction. Manuscript revised. Spelling and grammatical errors corrected. Experiment section described with source references. Authors could visit references for further studies. Redundancy is not a good ethics in scientific writing. Table 2 was adequately presented. It is a tabular result for preliminary findings, so using numbers is not adequate. Research of this class would always make do of reagents and chemicals of analytical grade. No need of stating Sigma Andrich, BDL and so on. Article is not a review no doubt, but we prefer the style we adopted because this work is not meant for scholars alone but to people who are also not scholars in these area of research. We think we should be commended for that. It will also help the present journal have a high impact. We prefer the literature style we adopted, hence, we would not rewrite it. Conclusion rewritten. Spelling and grammatical errors corrected. Visit Wikipedia for the meaning of "time immemorial". "Stvart Orbital Shaker" changed to "Stuart Orbital Shaker" Thank you once more for your review.
Minor REVISION comments	n/a	
Optional/General comments	n/a	