

### SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms JPRI 47659
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Antioxidant, Antimicrobial, Antityrosinase, and Anticholinesterase Activities of Psephellus hubar-morati
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 agree highlight that part in the many his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Kindly change your title as it doesn't reflect about the problem you have addressed or vice vera. Kindly revise your aim "The aims of this work were firstly, the gain of more information about total phenolic quantity, the study of the potential natural antioxidant, antimicrobial, antityrosinase, anti acetylcholinesterase, antibutyrylcholinesterase effect of extracts of Psephellus hubar-morathii, secondly to carry on the relationships between total phenolic content and studied activities"	
	There is no relationship with all. If it has then i have-not seen in your results. Frow where you have taken the picture? Fig. 1. RP-HPLC chromatogram of phenolic standards	
	How did you quanity? Table 1. Phenolic composition of the methanolic extract of Psephellus hubar- morathii	
	Kindly revisit your methdology and explain quantification method. Validate your results as well using LIMIT OF DETECTION, LOQ AND OTHER STATISTICAL TOOL.	
	Where are the IC50 VALUES? KINDLY PRESENT THEM? KINDLY VALIDATE YOUR RESULTS USING LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS.	
	INCOMPLETE TABLE 3. Antimicrobial activities of Psephellus hubar-morathii extracts (µg/mL).	
	AGAIN THE AIM YOU HAVE MENTIONED IN THE INTRODUCTION DOESNOT FALL WHAT YOU HAVE WRITTEN INSIDE THE DISCUSSION. ALL ABOVE ACTIVITIES ARE WRITTEN SEPARATELY AND NO CO-RELATION FOUND. IF THEY HAVE A RELATION THEN JUSTIFY IN DETAILS WITH CITATIONS.	
	THE CONCLUSION ALSO DOESN'T CO-RELATE WITH YOUR PROBLEM. KINDLY SYNCONIZE YOUR RESULTS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION WITH WHAT YOUR PROBLEM AND AIMS.	
Minor REVISION comments		

#### rathii

# eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

# SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



### SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	

### <u>PART 2:</u>

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agr
		highlight that part in the
		write 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:	Muhammad Shahzad Aslam
Department, University & Country	Xiamen University, Malaysia

## agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and e manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should ere)