

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79973
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Antioxidant and Antimicrobial activity of Organic and Inorganic Cauliflower Greens Powder ( Brassica oleracea var. botrytis L )
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://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p>The manuscript entitled "A Study on Antioxidant and Antimicrobial activity of Organic and Inorganic Cauliflower Greens Powder ( Brassica oleracea var. botrytis L )" has some merits, but is very poor written. It cannot be published in the present form. I made a few observations on the text using track change option.</p> <p>There are too many typographic mistakes that should be corrected. I suggest the authors to read a similar article in high impact factor journals and use the same style. English should be also checked and corrected. There are also too many typographic spaces between words.</p> <p>I would change title in "Antioxidant and Antimicrobial activity of Organic and Inorganic Cauliflower Greens Powder (<i>Brassica oleracea var. botrytis L</i>)". I wonder why the authors refer to organic and inorganic. Why not simply powder?</p> <p>Abstract is too general and does not includes what the authors searched; what methods the used; which are the main results; what is new etc. Please see a few abstracts in literature and make a more structured and informative abstract.</p> <p>Conclusions: very difuse and week in information. Too general.</p> <p>Therefore, a propose a severe revision of this manuscript before resubmitting.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> I observe no ethical issues with this manuscript.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gabi Drochioiu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza of Iasi, Romania</b>