

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80743
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY ON CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF ESSENTIAL OIL, ETHANOL EXTRACT, AND ANTI-CANCER, ANTI- BACTERIAL ACTIVITY OF ARTEMISIA RUTIFOLIA STEPH.ex SPRENG GROWN IN MONGOLIA
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>

**Review Form 1.6**

**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><b>Title</b>            ANTIBACTERIAL, ANTIOXIDANT and CYTOTOXIC STUDIES OF THE ESSENTIAL OIL AND ETHANOL EXTRACT OF AERIAL PARTS OF <i>Artemisia rutifolia</i> Steph.ex. Spreng (21 words) <b>OR</b> SOME BIOLOGICAL STUDIES OF THE ESSENTIAL OIL AND ETHANOL EXTRACT OF AERIAL PARTS OF <i>Artemisia rutifolia</i> Steph.ex. Spreng GROWN IN MONGOLIA, EAST AFRICA (24 words)            The chemical study was not used because it was only carried out on the oil</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be re-casted to reflect aim, methodology, results and conclusion</li> <li>• Corrections have been highlighted in the manuscript</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrections highlighted in the manuscript</li> <li>• Most literature cited are obsolete. A strong need for an update of all references cited</li> <li>• Literature did not tell us whether the plant is traditionally used as an antioxidant, antibacterial, anticancer in Mongolia or anywhere else in the world. Why the choice of these activities?</li> <li>• There are recent works that has been done on this plant which was not captured/mentioned by the Authors. There is a need for the Authors to bring to light the biological activity of other parts of the plant as revealed in literature.</li> <li>• How often does the biological activity of a plant grown in one place differ from that grown in other places????? So much work has been done on the biological potential of the plant. Emphasis should be more on the essential oil, rather than the ethanol extract. The ethanol extract could rather serve for comparison purpose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrections highlighted in the manuscript</li> <li>• How many extract/extracts/samples did the Authors exactly work on????</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation and discussion of results not too good enough</li> <li>• How did the Authors arrive at the conclusion that activity of extract/essential oil was moderate etc when there was no comparison with standard antibacterial agents? Not convincing!</li> <li>• Don't understand the preparation of soap under discussion. No mention of this aspect in title, aim, methodology etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of obsolete techniques/references..... A strong need for an update of all references cited</li> </ul> <p>Breakdown of References Cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2021 – 2016 = 2/19 = 10.5%</li> <li>• 2015-2010 = 3/19 = 15.8%</li> <li>• 2009 – 200 = 6/19 = 31.6%</li> <li>• Others = 8/19 = 42.1%</li> </ul> <p>Inconsistent method of citing journals and books, as well as, names of Authors; some initials, before surname, some surname before initials. Some journals italicized, some are not</p> <p><b>Supplementary materials</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 1 should have keys at the bottom to tell the readers what is RT, corr. A new column</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>should be added to tell the readers which are mono-. Sesqui- terpenoids etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figures 2 and 4 should be represented. There is no clear cut between the concentrations for the positive control and the extract. Or use keys in the form of colours to tell your readers which concs are for negative, positive controls and other test compounds (extract, essential oil etc)</li> <li>• No title on y axis of figure 2</li> <li>• Figures 3 and 5 seems clearer</li> <li>• Which figures are for 24 and 48 hours???</li> <li>• Table 2 should be made neater and re-casted. Avoid all the repetitions</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Full name of Acronyms/Words used should be used for the 1<sup>st</sup> time before the abbreviation</li> <li>2) Scientific names should be italicized. Authors should learn CORRECT spellings of names of organisms, please</li> <li>3) Repetition of full name of plant over and over again is not necessary</li> <li>4) Inconsistent use of units</li> <li>5) So many unclear statements/figures/graphs/paragraphs etc --- quite difficult to understand!!!</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Labake Ajoke Fadipe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</b>