

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_107078
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Analysis, Antifungal and Antibacterial Screening of Aegle marmelos: A Guyana Floral Extract
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes the study is important for the scientific community because it provides a good, generalized background regarding the importance of the plant <i>Aegle marmelos</i>. The title is concise, clear and adequate, for the content. It is comprehensive & the objective of the study is not defined in the abstract. No. Need improvement. Few References are old (1993). Update the references and make sure half of the references are in recent 5 years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot of grammatical errors that should be revised and corrected through proofreading. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Introduction is very lengthy. It is suggested that introduction section should be reduced and summarized. It should be focus on the study background, and impact of the study. Some sections described in the introduction can be potentially a discussion point such as significance and actions of <i>Aegle marmelos</i>, phytochemical constituents. The methodology used for phytochemical screening and biological studies are quite preliminary. Standard drug is not used for the comparison of the activity. Standard drug should be used for all experimental study. The results should be in proper style. The findings should be correlate and focus on the stated research methodology. The discussion is laconic. Discussion section not really discussed the result. What this finding means and what its implications are. Discussion should be elaborate with the significance of phytochemicals constituents. Correlation of phytoconstituents with biological activity needs to be properly done with respect to the actual phytochemical present in that particular plant of study which is responsible for such action. Conclusion didn't focus on the empirical findings of the stated research methodology. Justification of phytochemical screening and biological activities are not well defined and clear. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Illustration of figure and Tables are well define. But number of table is too many (14). It should be summarized to maximum 5-6 tables.•	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahla Imam
Department, University & Country	Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Jinnah Sindh Medical University, Pakistan