



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	2015_EJMP_17429
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening for Biological Activity of Eleven Medicinal Plants Used in Traditional Arabic Palestinian Herbal Medicine
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Authors have made mistakes in the References section. The list of references should be prepared according to the general guideline for Authors, eg: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.	References were checked and corrected according to the general guidelines for authors
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lines 47, 143 is: “..Candida..”, should be: “..Candida..” - line 65 is: “..80 %..”, should be: “..80%..” - change in each case in the manuscript - line 74 is: “..and 20µl of each..”, should be: “..and 20 µl of each..” - line 76 is: “..of 80µl of..”, should be: “..of 80 µl of..” - line 84 is: “* FL flower; LE leaves; UG Underground parts, FR Fruits”, should be: “* FL flower; LE leaves; UG underground parts; FR fruits” - line 87 is: “..mixing 25µl..”, should be: “..mixing 25 µl..” - line 88 is: “..(2.5mg/ml)..”, should be: “..(2.5 mg/ml)..” - line 89 is: “..with 10µl of AlCl₃..”, should be: “..with 10 µl of AlCl₃..” - line 98 is: “..25µl of..”, should be: “..25 µl of..” - line 99 is: “..and Gallic acid..”, should be: “..and gallic acid..” - line 111 is: “AAI=[DPPH] (µg ml⁻¹)/IC₅₀ (µg ml⁻¹)”, should be: “AAI=[DPPH] (µg/ml)/IC₅₀ (µg/ml)” - line 115 is: “..in table 2..”, should be: “..in Table 2..” - line 121 is: “..of 18 hour old..”, should be: “..of 18 h old..” - line 122 is: “..108 CFU/ml..”, should be: “..10⁸ CFU/ml..” - line 127 is: “..and Percent Inhibition (PI)..”, should be: “..and percent inhibition (PI)..” - line 132 is: “..(10mg/mL) and..... (32µg/mL)..”, should be: “..(10 mg/mL) and.... (32 µg/mL)..” - line 135 is: “..method [27] Plant extract..”, should be: “..method [27]. Plant extract..” - line 137 is: “..be 5 mg/mL..”, should be: “..be 5 mg/ml..” - line 139 is: “..of 1 × 10⁴ to 5 × 10⁴ colony-forming..”, should be: “..of 1 × 10⁴ to 5 × 10⁴ colony-forming..” - line 140 is: “..(CFU/mL)..”, should be: “..(CFU/ml)..” 	All comments were taken in consideration and corrections were made accordingly



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>- line 141 is: “..from 5 mg/mL down to 0.039 mg/mL..”, should be: “..from 5 mg/ml down to 0.039 mg/ml..”</p> <p>- line 144 is: “..from 250-1µg/mL for gentamicin, and from 16.0-0.125µg/mL for..”, should be: “..from 1-250µg/ml for gentamicin, and from 0.125-16 µg/ml for..”</p> <p>- line 151 is: “..(0.4mg/ml)...”, should be: “..(0.4 mg/ml)...”</p> <p>- line 153 is: “..(5 µg/mL)..”, should be: “..(5 µg/ml)..”</p> <p>- line 171 is: “..TPC..” – Authors should explain this abbreviation</p> <p>- line 172 is: “..of 0.53-14.9 mg..”, should be: “..of 0.53-14.91 mg..”</p> <p>- line 173 is: “..(14.9 mg GAE/g extract)..”, should be: “..(14.91 mg GAE/g extrat)..”</p> <p>- lines 173, 199, 218, 222, 231, 253, 254, 273, 277 is: “..<i>Rhus coriaria</i>..”, should be: “..<i>R. coriaria</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 175, 187, 198, 200, 231, 254, 278 is: “..<i>Epilobium hirsutum</i>..”, should be: “..<i>E. hirsutum</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 175, 187, 203 is: “..<i>Pistacia palaestina</i>..”, should be: “..<i>P. palaestina</i>..”</p> <p>- line 176 is: “..<i>Ephedra aphylla</i>..”, should be: “..<i>E. aphylla</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 188, 197, 202 is: “..<i>Urginea maritima</i>..”, should be: “..<i>U. maritima</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 189, 191, 196, 202, 253, 279 is: “..<i>Lycium schweinfurthii</i>..”, should be: “..<i>L. schweinfurthii</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 190, 207, 233 is: “..<i>Ceratonia siliqua</i>..”, should be: “..<i>C. siliqua</i>..”</p> <p>- line 191 is: “..<i>Echinops adenocaulos</i>..”, should be: “..<i>E. adenocaulos</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 196, 202, 220, 221, 223, 233, 254, 255 is: “..<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>..”, should be: “..<i>A. altissima</i>..”</p> <p>- line 196 is: “..<i>Alcea setosa</i>..”, should be: “..<i>A. setosa</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 201, 221, 232, 253, 273 is: “..<i>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</i>..”, should be: “..<i>E. camaldulensis</i>..”</p> <p>- line 219 is: “..60.9- 76.2..”, should be: “..60.8-76.2..”</p> <p>- lines 227, 235, in Table 4 is: “..(mg/mL)..”, should be: “..(mg/ml)..”</p> <p>- line 247 is: “..anti-dematophytic..”, should be: “..antidermatophytic..”</p> <p>- lines 251, 256 is: “..<i>Microsporum canis</i>..”, should be: “..<i>M. canis</i>..”</p> <p>- lines 251, 257 is: “..<i>Trichophyton rubrum</i>..”, should be: “..<i>T. rubrum</i>..”</p>	<p>Initials for plant species names were used following reviewer’s recommendation</p>
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- line 263 is: “..plant Extracts..”, should be: “..plant extracts..”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is an original and well-written. The title of the manuscript describes its content.	Thank you for your comments