

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_105101
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification and Quantification of phytochemicals in ethanol Leaf extract of Emilia praetermissa
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:

(<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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is very important especially the results wherein they can use it in the rural communities or remote areas as alternative medicine. Where are the objectives in conducting of this research. We can not conduct any research without a purpose or objective to conduct such research.</p> <p>Title is suited to the manuscript content.</p> <p>In my own opinion the comprehensiveness of the abstract is there. However, like my previous observations and suggestions, author's name should be reflected in the abstract in recognition of the researcher (s) and put footnotes to know what agency/research station he/she involved or working.</p> <p>As SOP for the scientific researches/paper, every paragraph should be indented not in block form or type.</p> <p>I observed that most of the terminologies used like the phytochemicals, disease symptoms or name are not properly spelled or misspelled. Words with anti should be written in two words ex. Anti-allergic and Pro-anthocyanidins</p> <p>References are enough and up-dated but check the spaces between each reference, some are double spaced and some are single spaced.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Be careful of the spellings particularly the phytochemicals mentioned and be consistent	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Indention in every paragraph is a must.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arturo O. Manipon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Philippines</b>