

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_125447
Title of the Manuscript:	Fungicidal Potentials of Leaf and Bark Extracts of Mimosa Pudica on Cowpea (Vigna Unguiculata L.) Seed Fungi.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The current problem of food insecurity and increases world population make this research of paramount importance. Even when food production it in limited supply post harvest loses to deterioration agents such as fungal agent it a matter of critical concerns. These deterioration agents especially fungal pathogens are known to release aflatoxins which affects human health, therefore studies of these agents are important.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title it okay as it captures the intention of the work.	
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 if not comprehensive enough as it lacks the complete summary of the work which include introduction, aim of the study, methodology, results and discussion. The abstract only focuses on lengthy discussion and values of important discoveries were not stated. More so there are conflictions in the report of the work as it was not sequential to good understanding to the reader.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All sections were fully were fully captured but not in sequential orders of good understanding, there missing methodology and results.	
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.	There are various complications in this study, were they were not correct information provided. Secondly the researcher it working on M.pudica but several others names of plants were mention in introduction, methodology and results. The statistical analysis had issues as superscripts were not provided for several tables.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references were complicated as a particular referencing style was not used. Researcher was using both in-text citations and APA style. And were in-text citations were used they were not attached correctly in the reference section and that makes it difficult for a review in the section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/ English quality was good but several words were used inappropriately and require measure revision.	
Optional/General comments	Requires measure revisions. SECTION V: Additional Comments (Journal required a detailed review for dew considerations)	

Review Form 3

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:	Longchi Satkat Zacchaeus
Department, University & Country	University of JOS, Nigeria