



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_SARJNP_44615   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Phytochemical Screening and Antimicrobial Activity of Leaves Extracts of Eucalyptus Camaldulensis and Eucalyptus Microtheca |
| 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)  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>Authors did not use any statistical test to determine significant differences among all extracts and they still claim “no significant difference” in line 123. There is no mention of the yield of each extract and for every group of secondary metabolites tested.</p> <p>Authors have to revise the correct Latin name of the microorganisms used, such errors should not happen if they attempt to publish their work.</p> <p>Authors should also check the English language professionally as there are many typos and grammar mistakes.</p> <p>Statements such as those in line 125 “the results of <i>his</i> study on the...” show a lack of a scientific tone for a manuscript submitted for publication.</p> <p>Why the rest of the concentrations 25, 12.5 and 6.25 mg/mL are not shown in Table 2? Authors did not explain this and do not mention them in the rest of the manuscript.</p> <p>Twenty one references are not enough considering that this topic is not new, authors are advised to include those as discussion.</p> <p>Line 10, study design, change to five solvents “of” different polarities.</p> <p>Line 10, methodology, change to five “concentrations” of each “extract”; remove “namely”; correct all Latin names (!) “<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>, <i>Escherichia coli</i>”; remove “(fungi)”.</p> <p>Line 19, change to “The <i>main</i> bioactive groups...”</p> <p>Line 25, choose either feet or meters but not both. Correct to “the plant family <i>Myrtaceae</i>”.</p> <p>Line 27, correct to “Leaf extracts”.</p> <p>Line 50, correct to “taxonomical identification”.</p> <p>Line 51, include the full name of the botanist.</p> <p>Line 56, at room temperature?</p> <p>Line 80, write CFU in full and the abbreviation in brackets.</p> <p>Line 94, remove “below”.</p> <p>Line 95, correct to These results are in disagreement...”</p> <p>Line 108, write IZ in full.</p> <p>Line 109, correct to “are presented in Table 2”.</p> <p>Line 112, remove “particularly in high concentrations” are those were the only ones tested or shown in Table 2. Same for lines 114, 119.</p> <p>Line 117, authors should mention that is dose-dependent.</p> <p>Line 123, which statistical test was used? Based on what do authors say no significant difference?</p> | <p>Good note from reviewer but Authors did not use any statistical test, so we corrected to “There were no clear differences” and we consider your note in future work.</p> <p>Author's were corrected Latin name of the microorganisms and checked the grammar mistakes.</p> <p>The statement in line 125 corrected to “their results on the ethanolic extracts of <i>E. microtheca</i>”.</p> <p>Author's mentioned in line 112 and 113, that no antimicrobial activity was observed at low concentrations (25, 12.5 and 6.25 mg/mL); so we don't included in the Table</p> <p>Author's were agreed with reviewer, corrected the manuscript and highlighted the corrected part in the manuscript with yellow color.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>All Latin names are corrected.</p> <p>Was changed.</p> <p>We choose meters. The plant family Myrtaceae was corrected</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>The full name of the botanist was added (Dr. Ismail Margani Ismail).</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>CFU was written in full as “Colony Forming Unit per milliliter”</p> <p>Removed.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>IZ was written in full as “inhibition zone”</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Removed.</p> <p>corrected</p> <p>corrected to “There were no clear differences”</p> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |  |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> 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) |   |