



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_48128
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Antioxidant, Antimicrobial, Tyrosinase Inhibitor, Cytotoxic Activities Phenolic Profile of <i>Isatis cappadocica</i> subsp. <i>alyssifoli</i> and Evaluation of The Plant's Applicability in The Pharmaceutical Field
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	<p>Revise the title of the manuscript to "Evaluation of Antioxidant, Antimicrobial, Antityrosinase and Cytotoxic Potentials of <i>Isatis cappadocica</i> subsp. <i>Alyssifoli</i> as a potent pharmaceutical resource"</p> <p>The word highlighted in red are to be verified and the ones in yellow were corrected.</p> <p>The instruments used were not all listed.</p> <p>50 grams could not have been enough for the studies. Perhaps what is the percent yield of the extract if only 50g was immersed in 500ml methanol?</p> <p>First write in full before the abbreviations: HPLC, DAD, MTT.</p> <p>How were the antioxidant capacities (FRAC, CUPRAC, DPPH AND Total phenolics) calculated after spectrophotometric readings?</p> <p>The antityrosinase activity procedure should be more descriptive. How about stating this concentration highlighted in red in the line 174 "varying concentrations of kojic acid solutions".</p> <p>Give information on the MIC and IC50 determination. There are tables (4 and 5) in the results section that reported them. Their method are lacking in the materials and methods section.</p> <p>There should be a stated approach to show how the data were analyzed and presented.</p> <p>Maintain the same significant figure in all the data. See table 1</p> <p>Take each table and figure to the results section just where you interpreted them.</p> <p>For reference of these natures: Karakoca et al. (2013), Miceli et al. (2017), Mohn et al. etc. SEE the Authors guideline.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The conclusion is poorly written. Make it precise and lucid.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Attend to the raised issues and fix the grammatical errors.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Uchendu, Mbah Okuwa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>