



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_45656
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIMICROBIAL AND ANTIHELMINTIC EFFECT OF WONDERFUL KOLA (Buchholzia coricea)
Type of the 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The title should not be in uppercase in line 1</li> <li>- Replace 'coricea' with 'coriacea' throughout the entire manuscript</li> <li>- Replace 'antimicromial' with antimicrobial in line 9</li> <li>- "... on eggs on Ascaris lumbricoides." In line 15 does not make meaning</li> <li>- Were these factors in lines 17 &amp; 18 ascertained in the study??</li> <li>- Be consistent with the spelling of cola and kola</li> <li>- Start with 'Less' instead of 'less' in line 51</li> <li>- Replace 'where' with 'were' in line 62</li> <li>- Filterate should be changed to filtrate in line 87</li> <li>- 'Ofloxacin' should read 'ofloxacin' as in line 92</li> <li>- There were no discussions in relation to the control (Ofloxacin) used in the study</li> <li>- Figure 2 has no depiction of the control (Ofloxacin)</li> <li>- 500 C in line 138 does not make meaning unless with a degree sign</li> <li>- 'Candicas' in line 146 should read 'Candida'</li> <li>- 'Trichuria' in line 159 should read 'Trichiuria'</li> <li>- 'Klesiella' in line 213 should read 'Klebsiella'</li> </ul>	<p>Title has been corrected</p> <p>Corrected as per the comments</p> <p>Correction done as per the comment</p> <p>All corrections have been effected</p> <p>All corrections have been effected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected as instructed</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace 'Hospitals' with 'Hospital' in line 10 if there's only one teaching hospital</li> <li>- Omit one of the Port Harcourt's in line 63</li> <li>- 'Kolanut' should read kola nut throughout the entire manuscript</li> <li>- 'Satoric Gottingen' should read 'Sartorius Gottingen' in line 76</li> <li>- 'Soxhlet' is a proper noun and must start with a Capital letter in line 81</li> <li>- 'Steriods' should read 'steroids' in line 108</li> <li>- 'Keller – Killani' should read 'Keller – Killiani' in line 115</li> <li>- 'Forcept' should read 'forceps' in line 155</li> </ul>	<p>Corrections done</p> <p>Made the corrections</p> <p>Correction done'</p> <p>Corrected and effected</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please check for grammatical errors throughout the manuscript</li> <li>- A picture of the B. coriacea plant would be useful for readers</li> </ul>	<p>Grammatical correction has been done</p>

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	