



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_45933
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activity of Ethanolic Extract of Egg Plant (Solanum melongena Linn) Fruit
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript has a clearly laid out structure with the topic of the study stated and the introduction provided to familiarize the reader with the plant under investigation. There are however some issues that need to be addressed. It is always an advantage when a paper includes references from the last 5 years (authors cite and/or discuss only 6 papers that have been published since 2014). There are at least a few more recent publications to which the authors could compare their results. There are also a few spelling mistakes.	Thank you. I have worked on the spellings. I have effected a change in the reference in the introduction. However, most of the study on this plant species was done before 2015. Kindly make do with that considering that other reference aside those of the plant studies were with 4 years of study to the present day.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>From a statistical point of view there is a need to unify the number of decimal places in the manuscript. Authors did it very well. The only question I have if it is necessary to show "mean % inhibition" with two decimal places? In my opinion 100% looks better than 100.00% especially when the differences between the reported values are quite large (e.g. 45% vs 93% or 82% vs 95%).</p> <p>It is not necessary to use words like "above" in the manuscript. The authors do not necessarily know how the final manuscript will look like. I would recommend referring to a figure by its number.</p> <p>The first sentence of the discussion part is important. In my opinion it should start with a introductory sentence, e.g. "We have demonstrated that....(figure 1, 2....)" rather than that "figures showed".</p> <p>The full names of chemicals (ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid) should be included in the materials and methods sections.</p> <p>There are a few spelling mistakes: page 1 <i>in vitro</i>, page 6 <i>in-vitro</i>, page 7 <i>In vitro</i>. Only in the title is written <i>in vitro</i> (both words in italics, a correct form). page 1 line 8: 1,1-diphenylpicrylhydrazyl to 1,1-diphenyl-2picrylhydrazyl page 1 line 10: reducing/antioxidant potential to reducing potential page 2 line 26: 25°C-48-seven two hours to 25°C for 48-72 hours page 2 line 31: picry to picryl page 7 line 34: <i>chrysophyllum</i> to <i>Chrysophyllum</i></p>	<p>I used double digits because some of the answers from the figure were in fraction and it should not be overlooked. Approximating the values will like impact the variances observed. The essence is to estimate such variance.</p> <p>I have worked on it. Thank you.</p> <p>Thank you for noting that. I have also worked on it.</p> <p>Thank you for noting that. I have also worked on it. It is among the once lighted in yellow in the work.</p> <p>Thank you. I have also worked on them. they are among the once lighted in yellow in the work.</p>
Optional/General comments	Overall, I think that the manuscript, after including the aforementioned suggestions, is suitable for publication in Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences.	Thank you.

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>	