



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	Original Manuscript

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 subject of this paper is interesting and the data could provide some contribution about toxicology and application for the plant, however, the article present serious problems concerning presentation, organization, grammatical errors, lack of information making difficult to have comprehension about the data presented. A deep revision is necessary to make the paper suitable for publication. Abstract: Some corrections are necessary: the scientific name of plant, "Qantitative estimations of phytochemicals revealed 123.2±04, 13.95±0.91 and 8 9.20±0.01 of phenols, saponin and alkaloids respectively" the units are missing. Introduction: The information about how toxicological study was conducted should be more clearly stated in abstract. The first phrase of first paragraph is too long, compromising the comprehension. The authors should complement the rest of the text of this paragraph with a reference. Overall, a grammar review would improve the quality of the text. The literature present some works depicting biological properties of the plant that could be cited over the introduction. Methodology: More information about the collecting of plants are necessary such as geographical localization, period of the year. The references cited in the item "quantitative determination of extract" are not in the list. The information about extract preparation is scarce; the yield of product resulting from the process should be informed. In item "Susceptibility Testing of Plant Crude Extracts and Fractions from Partitioning" it is not clear the reason why DMSO is used as a negative control. The unit of doses (mg/kg?) is not present in the Acute Toxicity Study, the route of	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	administration is not informed. Since the authors have used rodents for the study, there is the necessity of a local ethics committee approval, this is not presented in the article. The information about species, weight and age of animals is missing. How was the blood collected? Results: The qualitative analysis is not matching with quantitative analysis, flavonoids were not detected in methanolic fractions as well as phenol in aqueous fraction. How does the authors explain this fact? There is no information about statistical analysis. The table is not in the order described in the text. The authors did not mention about the approval of local ethical committee for animal studies.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thaís Posser
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Pampa, Campus São Gabriel RS, Brazil