

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79786
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial and biochemical properties of Linum Usitatissimum the flax seeds and Syzygium Aromaticum
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

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>1)Scientific terms must be used instead of using common words.(check highlighted with red-write resistant or susceptible instead of using words such as enemy etc in abstract)</p> <p>2)Sentence framing should be proper with good quality of English language for the reader to understand.</p> <p>3) short forms should not be used for numbering as well as written part (eg: 2-two; they're –they are)</p> <p>4)Species name in scientific name should be in small letters. entire paper is in wrong notation of scientific name.It should also be in italics. Please correct it(eg:<i>Linum Usitatissimum</i> should be written as <i>Linum usitatissimum</i>)</p> <p>5) Table 1 in the refined water concentrate of flax terpenoids, heart glycosides, tannins and saponins were available yet no flavonoids But it did not match with tabular data.</p> <p>6) In Table 1. Results of all column tabular data was not discussed</p> <p>7)While describing activity of table 2 and 3,concentration of extract and zone diameter should also be indicated in brackets.</p> <p>8) In table 4, at what concentration of extract antifungal activity exhibited should also be indicated in brackets.</p> <p>9)Table 5 results were not analysed properly. which extract inhibited which fungus and at what level should be clearly discussed.</p> <p>10)short forms should not be written for essential oils as EO.</p> <p>11)Modes of action should be predicted using proper references.</p> <p>12)Zones of inhibition plates against various bacteria and extracts need to be submitted</p> <p>13)Conclusion part not written</p> <p>14) 3)Positive and negative controls should be properly discussed and should be compared properly with tabular data</p> <p>14)How standard is reflecting on evaluation of data should be properly discussed.</p> <p>15) A brief acknowledgment section is needed.</p> <p>16) Declaration of competing interest should be disclosed.</p> <p>17) citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets .</p> <p>18) references should follow the style as per manuscript guidelines.</p> <p>19) Check author guidelines for declaration of AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS,CONSENT,ETHICAL APPROVAL</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1)Heart glycosides Should be replaced with cardiac glycosides</p> <p>2)The main oil and eugenol were inhibitorous for all tested strains was written in discussion.That oil name should be mentioned.</p> <p>3)year of reference should also be quoted along with author name in discussion part</p> <p>4)There is repetition of your own results in discussion part.if not, quote reference</p> <p>5) H₂SO₄ 2 and 4 should be written as subscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1)Highlighted yellow-already corrected</p> <p>2)Highlighted red-need to be corrected(or technical terms should be used)</p> <p>3)Figure and table captions should reflect the depth in subject. There are no figures at all to describe experiment with proof</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Surya Satya Sravanthi Pammi
Department, University & Country	SVRK Government Degree College, India