



**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.</p> <p>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 "<i>are</i> 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>	
<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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i>Dalia Goldhaber</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Leiden University, The Netherlands</i>