



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_53166
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and toxicological study of <i>Neptunia oleracea</i> Lour. (Mimosaceae) extracts, plant use in traditional medicine
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>)

**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><b>Title should be recasted as:</b> Phytochemical screening and toxicological studies of <i>Neptunia oleracea</i> Lour. (Mimosaceae) extracts</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> Abstract section has been scrutinized, all corrections should be effected</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Phytochemical screening was earlier conducted on the plant as youve reportedly mention here, what was the need to conduct it again? What do you mean very few data in Line 30-32? Was there any report on toxicity whether acute or sub-chronic? You indicated phytochemical screening in the manuscript but it was not captured in your aim, i suggest you should harmonise the content because you stated that the phytochemical screening was conducted already on thesame extracts you are working on.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> All comments can be seen in the word file</p> <p><b>Results</b> Table 3 and 4 should be merged because they are talking about the same thing; other corrections can be viewed in the word file</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> Recast the discussion section completely by discussing your findings, avoid repeating results</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b><i>Amina Yusuf Jega</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto, Nigeria</i></b>