

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83302
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of In Vitro Antioxidant Potential of the Polyphenols and the Sulphated Polysaccharides fractions of Ulva lactuca and Turbinaria ornata
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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	The substance of the manuscript with the title "Assessment of In Vitro Antioxidant Potential of the Polyphenols and the Sulphated Polysaccharides fractions of Ulva lactuca and Turbinaria ornate" is good because there is a novelty and the research data is also processed statistically. However, the manuscript needs to be revised, namely: Abstracts are made in scientific journal format and eliminate unnecessary words and describe a summary of the results of the research carried out, keywords are made sequentially with initial letters in alphabetical order, introduction is attempted to use references from 2012 and above by more than 50 percent, formulas in research methods each is numbered sequentially, paragraphs describing the results of the research are placed before the table, and paragraphs that support the results based on related references are placed after the table, and also if possible supported by references from 2012 and above by more than 50 percent, conclusion is made by indicating the conclusion of the results of the research carried out. not only qualitatively but also quantitatively, and references are made if possible preferably references in 2012 and above by more than 50 percent (ideally 80%).	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Improvement of English by using English for scientific journal writing	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	In general, the results of the research from this manuscript are good with the discovery of novelty supported by statistically processed data, although improvements need to be made, especially in the abstract and keywords that are made according to the abstract format of scientific journals and describe the results of the research carried out, the formulas in the research method are numbered, the paragraphs which support of the research results in the discussion are placed under the Tables, conclusion is shown in a quantitative summary of the results of research carried out, and references in the introduction, discussion and list of references if possible as much as above 50% for references in 2012 and above	

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tatik Khusniati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), Indonesia</b>