

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_100806
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical screening, evaluation of anti-salmonella activity and acute toxicity of Azadirachta indica (A. Juss) oil seeds
Type of the Article	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://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>it is helpful for scientific community particularly for medicinal use.</p> <p>No Phytochemical screening was present. The topic may be "Evaluation of anti-bacterial activity and acute toxicity of Azadirachta indica (A.Juss) seed oil".</p> <p>The abstract content should be reduced and it is too lengthy.</p> <p>Yes ,but the number should be given from introduction to conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient and the author did not follow proper literature survey. If the references are more it is better.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes ,it is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>a.No phytochemical screening work was carried out.</p> <p>b.Eventhough the process is already carried out in research, this may be accepted due to the place is varied.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes, 1. Selected three bacterial species and two exhibit anti-bacterial activity. 2. Acute toxicity and MIC were carried out. 3. Evaluation of medicinal value of the plant.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P. R. Santhi
Department, University & Country	Anand Institute of Higher Technology, India