

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_96429
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening and Evaluation of Some Biological Activity of Sarcocephalus latifolius Smith (Rubiaceae) Extracts
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 '**lac k of N o velt y**', 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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free</p>	<p>Yes, the study describes the potential use of extracts of <i>Sacocephalus latifolius</i> to control pathogens, particularly, <i>P. aeruginosa</i> and <i>S. pneumoniae</i>.</p> <p>Yes, the title corresponds to the content of the article.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive. Yes, both are correct.</p> <p>Yes, the information of the manuscript is well correlated, mainly the phytochemical study with the biological activities of the extracts.</p> <p>References are Ok,</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information is well organized. - All sections are adequate. - Only few changes should be considered which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table 1.- Please explain, why is the number of individuals of the "Sex" different from that of the individuals of the "Age"? - Table 2.- The units of the data must be included. - The LC50 are not correct. For instance, in Figure 6, concentrations of 5, 10 and 20 (mg/mL) must not be considered for linear regression. - In Figure 7, the dispersion of points is not adequate for linear regression. 	

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:	Sergio Arturo Galindo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, México