

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 Palestine	
	Type of the Article	Original Research Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 highlight that part in the manu 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.	
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.	

nus Angustifolius Ethanolic Extract in

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write



PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed highlight that part in the manus his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mariana Andrade
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Health Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Portugal

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write