

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_103498</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PRELIMINARY PHYTOCHEMICAL AND ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY SCREENING OF THE LEAF EXTRACT OE EMILIA PRATERMISSA</b>
Type of the 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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Plants that are used in drug preparation were a very attractive issue for the pharmacological company many scientific manuscripts were published in these criteria, this manuscript focuses on EMILIA PRATERMISSA leaves and their ability to use water and alcoholic extract from these plants as antimicrobial properties so the manuscript was very important in the scientific community The title of the article was suitable the abstract of the article was comprehensive the manuscript subsections and structure were appropriate the manuscript was scientifically correct the references were not recent and must be updated (less than 12% of it above 2016)	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of the article was suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ammar Mahmood Al-Aalim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mosul University, Iraq</b>