



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_53184
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of Aqueous Extract of Artemisia aucheri Seed on Acanthamoeba in Vitro
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstracts should be corrected according to journal guideline; Introduction is not perfect. The cause of choosing this plant is not mentioned The results section should be reviewed and the data should be scientifically reported and Referring to the Statistical tests is not required.</li> <li>Keywords must be reviewed and verified on the mesh.</li> <li>In the method section, there is no exact time for treatment, for example in the sentence "After two or more days" in A. Trypan Blue Test section. Also in the MTT test, why didn't measure the 48 and 72-hour timescale? Why were concentrations of 2000, 1000 and 500 not measured in this test?</li> <li>The results section should be reviewed and the data should be scientifically reported. Charts are not scientific and clear and need to be redesigned. How was the IC50s interview? Results of Flow-Cytometry should be scientifically reported.</li> <li>The discussion section needs to be rewritten, and the unneeded content will be deleted and the main content will be dealt with. So that at the beginning of the discussion, the main finding is mentioned and the rest of the content, written around it.</li> <li>The references are not in accordance with the journal's format.</li> <li>The references are manually entered into the text of the article and are in error.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>  This study was approved by the Ethics Committee for Research at Semnan University of Medical Sciences with the ID MUMS.REC.1396.263. Therefore, the study has no ethical problems	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Hadi Zare Marzouni</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Iran</i></b>