Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_81196**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ANTIULCER ACTIVITY AND ISOLATION OF CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS FROM ETHANOLIC STEM BARK EXTRACT OF FICUS BENGALENSIS**
Type of the Article	**Full paper**

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	1. This work presents results pertaining to phytochemical screening and anti-ulcer potential of ethanolic stem bark extract of *Ficus bengalgensis*. The constitution chemical and anti-ulcer potential of plants is an important field that historically has received intense interest by the scientific community. In this context, the manuscript could attract interest from readership of the journal. 2. The manuscript is sufficiently clear and technically sound.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. I suggest that the article should be accepted just after **MAJOR REVISION**.	
Optional/General comments	Specific Comments: 1. Title: It is adequate. 2. Keywords: It is adequate. 3. Abstract: It is adequate. 4. Introduction: In article the introduction provided important information about its research field. 5. Materials and Methods: This section was adequately composed. 6. Results and Discussion: The author(s) managed to discuss the results very well and compare the results with other studies conducted by international researchers. 7. Conclusion: Concise and direct. Very good. 8. References: It is adequate. But in the manuscript, I suggest the need to add new references to support some arguments. 9. Other remarks are placed in the manuscript itself. Please check them directly in the attached file.	

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Jailton de Souza-Ferrari**
Department, University & Country	**Federal University of Paraiba, Brazil**