

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_84466
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of spice form and extraction period on Total Phenolic Content of Selected Ugandan Spices
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:

(<https://www.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy>)

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>2.3 - Sample preparation: Need to descend better, when dry, how did it happen? Kiln dried at what temperature? Or dried at room temperature? dry in the shade?</p> <p>If obtained differently, describe all forms. it is also suggested to add the yields of the extracts obtained if possible.</p> <p>Corretc: 100mls of hot distilled water (100 mL) This item needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>3.0 Results and discussion It is necessary to use references with data from the literature to improve the discussion of the results obtained in the work</p> <p>Spices, especially those with high phenolic contents, have recently received a lot of attention because of their nutritional and medicinal values. Their anti-inflammatory, anticancer, anti-hypertensive, antibacterial and antioxidant properties make their study a worthwhile venture. (add a reference)</p> <p>This could be because the longer the spice particles stay in hot water, the greater the likelihood of solvent water molecules interacting with and dissolve out the phenolic molecules out. (add a reference) In addition, the dry/processed samples yielded better TPC amounts than fresh ones whether extracted for four or 40 minutes with the exception of Allium sativum. This indicated that the drier the sample, the better the hot water molecules will dissolve the phenolics from its tissues. Fresh materials contain a lot of water (water content), which may neither be replaceable nor removable. In addition, the percentage of phenolic molecules per unit weight of the fresh samples is low. Differences in TPC yields among species are probably due to variations in maturity and genetics. (add a reference).</p>	<p>Corrected</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Reference added</p> <p>Reference added</p> <p>Reference added</p>
Minor REVISION comments	2.2 - add the voucherVoucher numbers have been added.....
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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	<p>This paper is part of a bigger study that includes animal use and therefore has ethical issues, which were cleared by Gulu University as reflected in 2.6 with Number GUREC-110-18.</p> <p>However this paper itself has no ethical issues.</p> <p>A few more changes were effected as found appropriate. One of the main was what the botanist highlighted; that the <i>Ocimum</i> species we evaluated was <i>Ocimum gratissimum</i> and not <i>Ocimum sanctum</i>. This led to the changes in literature and discussion.</p> <p>All the changes effected were highlighted with yellow.</p>