



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48966
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Minerals, Total Phenolic Content, Flavonoids, Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activities of sweet Lupinus Angustifolius Ethanolic Extract in Palestine
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 159: Please provide more references to support your findings. Lines 168-169: "(...) since the efficiency of ethanol extraction from plant material is greater and environmentally friendly when using ethanol-water system than methanol-water" Please rephrase. In the sections 3.5 and 3.6, the authors should compare their results with one or two more researches. In all the results, standard deviations and statistical analysis should be included. In all the manuscript, replace "alcohol" by "ethanol". The authors should include, if possible, photographs of the produced extracts.	1. Line 159: New reference was added and another sentence was added (New 17). 2. Lines 168-169 were rephrased 3. Two additional references were added (New ref. 18 and 19). Total number of references became 23 instead of 20. 4. The subfamily was corrected 5. Lines 150-151 were rewritten 6. The word "alcohol" was replaced with "ethanol" in the whole manuscript 7. We do not have photographs of the extracts! 8. For item 3.6 as far as we know there are no references to be cited. 9. Some other sentences or phrases were also rewritten upon the recommendation of the second reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 24: Please double check the name of the subfamily. I think the authors meant "Papilionoideae" instead of "Papilioniodeae". Lines 141-147: Please provide more references to support your findings. Lines 150-151: Please rewrite the second part of the first sentence "(...) until it reaches 70% ethanol, where the maximum content is observed".	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is very clear and well-written. I recommend its publication in the "European Journal of Medicinal Plants" as "Short Research Article" and encourage the authors to continue their research.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	