



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_64603
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL ACTIVITIES OF ARTEMISIA VULGARIS AND ACACIA NILOTICA PLANT EXTRACTS
Type of the Article	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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )

**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>Material and methods part:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Justify your unique choice for the plants chosen and why not else</li> <li>- Try to cite the references to justify your choice of the said extraction method</li> </ul> <p>You must detail and justify with similar works (References) your choice of methods of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparation of Nutrient Media</li> <li>- Preparation of 1M DPPH solution</li> <li>- Inoculation and Agar well diffusion</li> </ul> <p><b>Bibliographical references</b></p> <p>In relation to the theme dealt with in this article, it seems to me that the bibliographical references cited in this document are insufficient from a qualitative and quantitative point of view. So the only 10 references that you have consulted are insufficient to properly frame this article. On the other hand, there are not really recent references, given what this kind of research requires and the availability and accessibility of work on the subject covered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are many mistakes and gaps in the presentation of bibliographic references (omissions in terms of pagination, publisher..etc)</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Spelling and writing</b></p> <p>Read your article carefully and try to correct misspellings (even scientific names of plants) throughout the document as well as mastering the writing of the text</p> <p><b>Conclusion part:</b></p> <p>The conclusion needs a little more detail as well for the recommendations</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>Title:</b></p> <p>The title does not match what you have tested as a plant. In the title we understand that you have worked on only two plants but in the abstract there is more</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Boukerker Hassen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Scientific and Technical Research Center, Algeria</b>