



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_51318
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary biological study of two medicinal plants used in the Mouhoun region (Burkina Faso): <i>Boscia angustigolia</i> A. Rich (caparaceae) and <i>Gardenia erubescens</i> Stapf & Hutch (Rubiaceae)
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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodology for inhibiton zones determinations, names for the bacterial strains, and phytochemical methods missing. 2. Recommendations should also be included. 3. Rewrite your abstract not more than 250 words <p>Literature Review:</p> <p>Studying an ethnopharmacological claims.. a literature review on antimicrobial, antibacterial activities is recommended, the importance of bioactive ingredients is missing and also we need the photos of these plants.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presence of phenolic compounds is too general and needs to be done categorically,,,the relevant ones needed. You have also limited to two bioactive..flavonoids and phenolic..These are just too few to qualify your article 2. A study of medicinal value of a plant cannot be satisfactorily accepted with no studies on determination of minimum bactericidal concentrations <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The photos showing the minimum inhibition zones is indeed appreciated to justify your work and microtitre plates showing the minimum inhibition concentrations 2. A data showing percentage frequency of diseases ethnopharmagological treatments using the said herbs is needed. <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Some of your references are not correctly quoted eg number 24..the plant caparaceae is not mentioned in the reference.</p> <p>More arguments is needed in your discussions eg the role of phytochemical constituents is not mentioned at all and is very subjective in a preliminary study while justifying a medicinal value of a plant.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Clearly written recommendations needed</p>	<p>Thank you very much Dear Reviewer for your important remarks. We have taken them into account in this corrected version of the manuscript. For the abstract it is not worth 250 words, it is composed of 214 words. Photos of the plants were integrated in the manuscript. Regarding the conformity of the references, in this case reference 24, there is in the heel of pages 13, 31 of this article, Carapaceae whose antioxidant and antimicrobial activity has been demonstrated.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	NO	
Optional/General comments	NO	

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)	