

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105028
Title of the Manuscript:	GCMS, FTIR and NMR analysis of chloroform extract of Azadirachta indica
Type of the 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The work is important. Neem has been extensively investigated for decades. The author must indicate whether each of the compounds analysed is newly discovered in Neem or whether it is a contribution to earlier discoveries. He presented three of the compounds as new discoveries in Neem's chloroform extract.</p> <p>2. Not suitable. He used abbreviations. "Bioassay of some compounds isolated from chloroform extracts of Neem leaves" more appropriately describes the work.</p> <p>3. The author must read the journal's guideline. The abstract is not well written. My comment is on the MS.</p> <p>4. The conclusion is not obvious.</p> <p>5. Subject to corrections suggested, the manuscript will be correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient. Maybe they were muddled up by the system. They appeared not well written.</p> <p>7. If the author is a research student, s/he must submit this paper to her/his supervisor for correction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The grammar must be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fasakin Adeyinka Olubunmi
Department, University & Country	Ekiti State University, Nigeria