



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25815
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBACTERIAL AND TOXICOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF LEAF EXTRACTS OF GUIERA SENEGALENSIS AGAINST GRAM NEGATIVE BACTERIA.
Type of the 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 above article is on antibacterial and toxicological evaluation of leaf extracts of <i>Guiera senegalensis</i> against gram negative bacteria. It is appropriate for the journal. However, the presentation of the work is unprofessional (poor writing skills). There are many sloppy mistakes and inconsistency, and spelling errors. Before being accepted for publication the authors need to pay careful attention to the points listed below. 1. Abstract: The abstract was poorly structured, the authors should - start the abstract with a concise and accurate summary of the significance & objectives of the study. Then, state the selection of the study material, the basic methods, the main findings, and finally state the general conclusions (i.e. highlight new and important aspects of all findings of the study). - add Author of plant species when first mentioned in the abstract. - type the plant name in <i>Italic</i> throughout the abstract. - identify the measurement unites of quantitative estimations throughout the abstract. - provide the exact effect size of the control. - Keywords: type the full name of the plant. - The sentence No. 3 (line 8-12) is an example of very poor academic writing of the abstract... It is a mix of methodology and	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	results. It is long unsound, inconsistent. - Your abstract must be typed in a logical sequence - (please rewrite) 2. Introduction : The introduction was poorly structured, inconsistent and there are critical sloppy mistakes - Paragraph No. 1 was superfluous. It would be better to connect it with the Paragraph No. 2 deleting the repeated ideas. - Paragraph No. 1; sentence 1. This long soundless sentence is not accepted in modern academic writing. Break up it. - Paragraph No. 2; sentence 3. Break up it to 3 sentences typing the plant related effects separately. - Same sloppy mistakes were detected in the following paragraphs - Your introduction must be typed in a logical sequence providing references for all the reported effects - (Please rewrite). 3. Matreials and Methods - Inconsistency, poorly writing skills were detected throughout this section (please revised it) - The methods should include information on taxonomic identification. 4. Result - Inconsistency and very poorly writing skills were detected throughout this section (please revised it). E.g. table or Table, referring to the same Table two times in the same (this is completely superfluous)... and many - (please revised it)	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. Discussion: - Very poorly structured - The authors not have the basics of academic writing. Just example, the authors referred to the table in this section? and many	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Thamar University, Yemen