

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77011
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF SECONDARY METABOLITES AND ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL OF PLUMBAGO INDICA ROOT EXTRACTS
Type of the Article	Research work

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In Abstract, please go to the topic of research immediately without giving undesired introduction (please see my referred points shown the abstract and do my remarks).2. The English language of the manuscript should be fully revised and carefully edited by an English mother language person.3. The introduction is long and contains several undesired sentences und non understandable4. In the introduction, you have mentioned: however, there are currently various sophisticated ways accessible. Please give examples of such sophisticated methods you mean and their practical role for qualitative and quantitative analysis.5. The name of the plant under study should be written italic in the whole manuscript6. In the Material and Method section: The weight of the used plant's roots was not mentioned, and how much the amount of the powdered roots served in the phytochemical study.7. Under defatting of plant material: <i>P indica</i> powdered roots were shade dried at room temperature for 80 grams. This sentence is not clear not understandable8. The word "soxhletion" should be corrected to "soxhlation"9. The authors mentioned that they have extracted the defatted plant powder by chloroform, ethyl acetate, ethanol, and water. They should refer to subsequent extraction, that means starting with less polar extracting solvent followed by the higher and higher polarity solvent and ended by water.10. The authors mentioned that they have concentrated the solvents by water bath evaporation, however, this method is very hard and not favorable for the natural products and mostly accompanied by decomposition of the bioactive metabolites. Normally, the concentration till dryness is performed using <i>in vacuo</i> evaporation using rota-evaporator system.11. Table 1 shows the yield of extracts produced from <i>P. indica</i> roots using chloroform, ethyl acetate, ethanol, and water as solvents. Please refer to the percent of each obtained extract with respect to the whole extract of the plant's root used in this study.12. Regarding the qualitative estimation of the constituents of plant, the author used just only chemical reagents. The question, is there no other recent sophisticated/spectroscopic technique to evaluate such constituents qualitatively?13. Likely, is there no other recent spectroscopic methods to determine the constituents quantitatively rather than such conventional methods, which could be much more precise and faster?14. Discussion of the results obtained in this article is short and should be much more discussed in details supported by relevant literatures.15. The authors should refer in detail about the previous research work done regarding this species of plant "<i>P. indica</i>", and highlight on the reported	

Review Form 1.6

	bioactive compounds isolated previously from this plant, highlighting on its difference rather than the other species of same genus, and if the aerial parts of the plant (e.g. leaves, stems) have been studied before or not	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Shaaban
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Giza, Egypt