

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82500
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF SECONDARY METABOLITES AND ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL OF CENTAUREA BEHEN L. ROOT EXTRACTS
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### **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	1.- The Result and discussion aren't developed extensively, the tables and figures aren't fully described in text. 2.- The Discussion isn't present in the text, they don't compare the results with other authors. 3.- The conclusion should be quantitative, in order with the results of the tables and figures, supported by data. 4.- The conclusion hasn't a perspective. 5.- The results of the IC <sub>50</sub> need to show the statistic used and support it. 6.- In the introduction, some parts need support references	Amended revision  Corrected
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	1.- Some words are used out of context. 2.- The name of some compounds is misspelled 3.- Some phases should change their wording 4.- The origin of the biological sample are wildlife or part of a commercial production? Who can we know if the genetical variation of multiples samples affect the results?	Done
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Whit a strong statistical analysis, developing of the results presents on the tables and figures, discussion of the results and support of the conclusion the work will transmit a clear and strong message.	Done

### **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)	