



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48539
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and Mineral Characteristics of SaponaceousPlants
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The topic should read “ Evaluation of the phytochemical and mineral characteristics of some selected saponaceous plants”.</li> <li>2. Aims in the abstract should be adjusted to aim.</li> <li>3. The common names of the plant species used in the study should be written in front of the scientific names.</li> <li>4. The scientific names mentioned in the abstract have only generic names but no specie names. The scientific names should have both generic and specie names.</li> <li>5. The aim written at the end of the introduction is not an aim. It does not make meaning. Please, write out a concise aim for the research.</li> <li>6. Remove the line drawn under leaves and kernels in line 40.</li> <li>7. The outlines for all the parameters collected during the research are too shallow. Please, explain in step by step detail how each parameter was analysed not in summary.</li> <li>8. The manner in which the statistical analysis is not correct. What statistical tool was used to analyze your data? Is it ANOVA, chi-square, T-test? Consult literature for proper reporting of the section.</li> <li>9. Incorporate Tables and Figures in appropriate sections in the results and discussion segment. Let not stand alone.</li> <li>10. Subject Tables 3 and 4 to T-test to determine significant differences between treatments.</li> <li>11. Some figures in the manuscript have no titles. Please, input the titles of the figures.</li> <li>12. Please, make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript.</li> <li>13. Arrange the manuscript according to the specifications given by the journal.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corrected according to the Reviewer's suggestion.</li> <li>2. Fixed.</li> <li>3. Common names are now written in front of their scientific names, as suggested.</li> <li>4. The intended meaning is not clear. We assume that the Reviewer is requesting the authority to be included in the binomial nomenclature in the abstract.</li> <li>5. A concise aim has been included at the end of the introduction.</li> <li>6. Removed, as requested by the Reviewer.</li> <li>7. The materials and methods section has been proofread, but –in our view– sufficient detail on how each parameter was analysed is provided so that the experiments can be reproduced by others.</li> <li>8. Pearson's correlation test was used to assess the association among the quantitative variables. ANOVA + Tukey's HSD test was used to detect significant differences in Table 3. This has been clarified in section 3.8 of the revised ms.</li> <li>9. Figures and Tables have been relocated after the paragraphs in which they are first mentioned.</li> <li>10. An ANOVA has been conducted for Table 3 (please note that when the population means of only two groups is to be compared, the t-test is used, but when means of more than two groups are to be compared, ANOVA is preferred).</li> <li>11. Fixed.</li> <li>12. The entire manuscript has been thoroughly revised.</li> <li>13. Fixed. The manuscript has been arranged according to the instructions for authors (<a href="http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/13">http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/13</a>). References format has been corrected.</li> </ol>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript need to be rearranged into specifics to enhance understanding.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good work by authors but poor arrangement.	

**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>	