

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85944
Title of the Manuscript:	Antifungal Activity of Echinops echinatus and Fagonia cretica from Cholistan Desert-Pakistan
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.journalpri.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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Comments to the Author Your Manuscript entitled Antifungal Activity of <i>Echinops echinatus</i> and <i>Fagoniacretica</i> from Cholistan Desert-Pakistan which you submitted to the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International, has been reviewed. This paper can be accepted for publication in the journal after minor revisions. The comments from the review process can be found appended at the bottom of this letter. We hope that you will be able to undertake the additional work and look forward to receiving a revised manuscript.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Introduction: The author should also mention that the aim of their study was to examine the antifungal activity of compounds against <i>Echinops echinatus</i> and <i>Fagonia cretica</i>2. In the results and discussion needs more evidences and compare their own results those previously published similar study3. The conclusion section should be rewritten again in a more satisfactory way	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Required sentence has been added and highlighted in yellow in introduction section.2. Similar study has already mentioned in references number 13 and 14 and is highlighted in yellow.3. Conclusion has been rewritten and highlighted in yellow.
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	