

Open Access Publisher

Advancement in Medicinal Plant Research

Reviewers Guide

PART A: Reviewer information

SECTION I

Reviewer's Name	Henik Sukorini, Ph.D	
E-mail	hsukorini@yahoo.com	
Institution	University of Muhammadiyah Malang	
Manuscript Number	AMPR-2014-028	
Title	Evaluation of Antioxidant, Total Phenols and Flavonoids Content and Antimicrobial Actvities of Artocarpus altilis (Breadfruit) of Pulp, Peel and Whole of underutilized tropical fruit extracts	
Date Sent to Reviewer		
Date Expected from Reviewer		
Area of Specialization	Plant extracts, Plant Pathology, Microbiology	

PART B: Reviewer evaluations

SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment	The way to write was confusing. It was hard to understand. The author should follow the journal guidance. The manuscript should be checked by a person who English as her/his mother tongue, because many grammar mistakes.
Introduction	In the introduction part, unclear state and many un necessary parts for example the extraction (60-68), the microorganism (line 69-73). The Introduction should write about what are the problems and opportunity of medicinal plant? What the potential of the plant is? Is there any research before?, etc.
Methodology	Un clear and not detail. In 86how many g or kg each sample was collected. Plant extractionhow many ml? How many g of grounded material were used? How many ml of solvent?. Please check all the material and methods.



Open Access Publisher

Results	In the result and discussion part, the material and the methods should not re state.	
Discussion	The results should be discussed in relation to the Introduction. Give comment on results and indicate possible sources of error. Please add place the study in the context of other work reported in the literature.	
Bibliography/References	Please write as same as jounal guidance	
Others	Title and content of tables should same (566, plant parts or crude extract)	
Decision	Major revision	

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality	3
Contribution to the Field	2
Technical Quality	3
Clarity of Presentation	4
Depth of Research	2

SECTION IV - Recommandation: (Kindly mark with an X)

Accept as it is	
Requires Minor Corrections	
Requires Moderate Revision	
Requires Major Revision	The manuscript was not clear writing, many grammar mistakes, hard to understand.
Submit to Another Publication such as	
Reject on Grounds of (Please be Specific):	



SECTION V: Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments (including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any). Also, some English corrections should be done.



Open Access Publisher

