

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_92890
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical composition and biological activity of Guarea cedrata (A. Chev.) Pellegr. leaf and root bark essential oil
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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English should be revised throughout the text by a native speaker - Provide the voucher specimen of the studied plant - It is mandatory to test the antioxidant potency using different methods in order to confirm the activity and not only DPPH - In part 2.7.3 cite a reference of the used protocol - The discussion is very superficial and poor. Try to improve the discussion indicating the structure-activity relationship for example. The mechanism of resistance and a possible mode of action of the sensitive strains. In addition, what is the link between antimicrobial activity and the antioxidant potential, try to explain. Also the factor of the used part (leaves against roots). - In table 3, authors mention 13 mm for <i>C. albicans</i>, however in the interpretation they said 9 mm ?????!!!!!! THIS KIND OF CONFUSION IS UNNECCEPTABLE. - In the conclusion section, authors mention that the essential oil is active against <i>C. tropicalis</i>, however in the table and the results section, it's <i>C. albicans</i>. THIS KIND OF CONFUSION IS UNNECCEPTABLE. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Italic form for species names of microorganisms and the studied plant - Explain the choice of the strains. Why those strains? - In part 2.7.2 well diffusion method instead of microdilution, in the same paragraph authors mention (gentamicin or amphotericyn B respectively for fungi and bacteria), it's should be respectively for bacteria and fungi - In some tables and parts of the manuscript, please change the , into . - In general, Gram negative bacteria are more resistant than Gram positive because of the membrane composition. However, it's not the case in the present study, How authors can explain this ? 	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ikrame Zeouk
Department, University & Country	Morocco