

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_113873
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on the Germicidal Effect of Bitter Bark Tree (<i>Sacoglottis gabonensis</i>) on Water Purification
Type of the Article	

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. yes</p> <p>2. yes 3. No.</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some wording errors, like stuck solution to mean stock solution, back to mean bark.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clearly stated as background, aim, methods, result and conclusion <p>2. Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It seems your total work is a review. You wrote not less than 3 pages of introduction for this experimental work. You included every detail of others' work. You used to write a concise introduction. <p>3. Methods –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no statistical analysis <p>4. Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The result tables presented under methods section The result is very poorly stated/explained <p>5. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is very short with only one long paragraph <p>6. Ethical approval (however, not required), conflict of interest, and data availability not stated</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Wubetu Yihunie
Department, University & Country	Debre Markos University, Ethiopia