



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_55052
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Studies of Some Hemi-parasitic West African Plants
Type of the Article	Original Research Article (Please be specific)

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>The original article is a wonderful work of science. And I appreciate the standard of the experiments, however, there are some issues which is required to be solved, are being mentioned below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writings of the manuscript having some grammatical issues, please try to resolve them. You can easily use the online grammatical tools to correct the errors • The Abstract section seems too large, which greatly requires to be modified to transform it into a more precise one • There must be a sufficient number of background center sentences, which is lacking in the abstract section • What do you mean by standards? Please give supportive sentences to back this up • Also if you want to rationalize all of the points then do it similarly, using some points to get rationalize others are not does not fit well • Please use the full form of the acronym MRSA for the first time, then you can use the shorter form • Honestly speaking the overall writing quality is not standard enough for people of various ages from generals to the highest level of experts, So, please try to modify • The Introduction section must be moderated, as its lacking adequate sentences regarding the methods which are being used and sufficient touch of the outcome • There is no need to mention the model name of the machinery which is being used, however, if you are interested then add the model number too • The article as a source of an original manuscript lacks various critical information. like the sample size • What is IC-50? • Please provide rationale sentences to back up all of the points • It's better to be more precise than mention a general name of a method • The fonts have been used to indicate different sections in figure 1 is too small in stature • the manuscript is better suited as a proposed original study method article rather than traditional original research article or manuscript 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>S Danish Kadir</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Bangladesh</i>