



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_17481
Title of the Manuscript:	Antifungal activity of roots barks extract of <i>Securinega virosa</i> and <i>Anogeissus leiocarpa</i> , two plants used in the traditional treatment of candidiasis in northern Côte d'Ivoire.
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	1. Authors should use of the appropriate tenses: - Methods section should be written in the past tense because it is a report of what was done during the course of the study - Results section should be written in the past tense. because the experiments described in the text were completed before the paper was written. In this section the present tense is appropriate when referring to individual elements of the manuscript – Table or Figure. 2. Who identified the plants? This should be clearly stated in Material and Methods section. 3. In subsection 2.7. Phytochemical screening Authors cited Bolu et al [23] and Ouattara et al [24]. These references do not describe phytochemical screening of plants extracts. Why these articles have been cited by the Authors? 4. Table 2 and 3 –is written: “...in low concentration, ...medium concentration, ...high concentration” - Authors should specify values of these concentrations. 5. Where are Figures 3-7? Only Figure 1, 2, 8 and 9 are present in the manuscript.	1. Verb s of methods section and results section have been to the past. 2. Plants used in this study have been identified by Professor AKé-Assi Laurent of the National floristic Center University of Félix Houphouet Boigny Cocody Abidjan. 3. Bolu et al [23] and Ouattara et al [24] have been replaced by Yusuf <i>et al</i> [23], Mehta <i>et al</i> [24] which describe phytochemical screening of plants extracts. 4. It is a qualitative study so we highlight chemical constituents. “...in low concentration, ...medium concentration, ...high concentration” have been suppressed. 5. There are four figures. These have been renumbered: Figure 1, 2, 3 and 4.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Latin names should be italicized. 2. The full name of plant is given when it is cited first time. 3. Between the number and the name should be a gap, e.g. 12.5 mg/ml, 50 g, 1.15 mm 4. Replace “mL” to “ml”, “L” to “l”	1. Latin names have been italicized. 2. The full name of plant has been given first time. 3. Now there is a gap between the number and the unit. 4. “ml” replace “mL” and, “l” replace “L”
Optional/General comments		