

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	SouthAsianResearchJournalofNaturalProducts
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_SARJNP_125455
Titleof theManuscript:	GREEN APPROACHFORTHESYNTHESISOFCHROMENESDERIVATIVESBYCALEAPINNATIFIDA(R.BR.)LESS(BITTERGRASS)ANDPOTENTIALITY
Typeof the Article	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study demonstrates the green synthesis of chromenes derivatives from <i>Calea Pinnatifida</i> Less and their potential antimicrobial properties. These findings highlight the potential of natural sources for the synthesis of bioactive compounds with therapeutic applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title is not suitable and should be rephrased. The current title focuses on the synthesis of chromenes derivatives and the assessment of their antimicrobial activity. Therefore, the title should be rephrased as follows: "Green Synthesis of Chromenes Derivatives from <i>Calea Pinnatifida</i> Less and Their Antimicrobial Properties."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not comprehensive. The author provided a brief background, which is acceptable, but the abstract should also include the aim of the study, the methodology used, the pathogen targeted, the most significant findings, and a concise conclusion. In summary, the authors should address the following points in the abstract: 1. How the chromene derivatives were synthesized? 2. How was the antimicrobial activity of the synthesized compound tested? 3. What were the most promising results?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript needs revision before publication Materials and Methods: 1. The authors need to provide a detailed explanation of the scheme for the synthesis of 4H-Chromenes derivatives. 2. The authors should also describe how they characterized the obtained compounds. 3. Tables 2 and 3 are unclear: What is meant by the concentration of the compounds being 100%? Why was the screening specifically done with 100 µg/mL of the compound and then make more concentration to determine the minimum inhibitory concentration? 4. The antibacterial and antifungal methods need to be provided in detail. How were the cultures grown? Were they adjusted according to the McFarlan standard? How were the fungal spores counted? kindly provide all these details in your methodology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

ReviewForm3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?	There are a few grammatical errors, authors should attend to	
Optional/General comments	Authors should include pictures of their antimicrobial test.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kabange Kasumbwe
Department, University & Country	Durban University of Technology, South Africa