

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_114640
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL EVALUATION OF SELECTED PLANTS USED AS CHEWING STICKS IN OWERRI, IMO STATE, NIGERIA
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>In general, the concept this manuscript is important for scientific community, although many aspects of this concept have already been reported by other authors. Particularly, the quantitative analysis is important for scientific community. However, the authors did not cite any procedure of how the determination of quantitative analysis was done. Authors included several tables for quantitative parameters for several plants/several extracts. How are they obtained these parameters?</p> <p>Alternative title: PHYTOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATION OF PHYTOCHEMICAL COMPOSITIONS OF VARIOUS EXTRACTS FROM THE TWIGS OF SOME SELECTED PLANTS USED AS CHEWING STICKS IN NIGERIA</p> <p>No; In fact, the entire abstract should be modified.</p> <p>Appropriate but many corrections are required throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>The content is sufficient</p> <p>Sufficient. But the citation of references (in the text and at the end) did not follow the journal requirements.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO; very poor language; not acceptable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript describes about the phytochemical analysis of some chewing plant used in Nigeria. Although, the contents of the manuscript are sufficient, the way the material was presented was not acceptable standard. The manuscript is not acceptable standard for scholarly communications. The manuscript should be revised completely from title to conclusion. Many syntax errors, many grammar mistakes, lack of proper sentence formation, incomplete experimental details, lack of coherency and many others (please see the comments given in the manuscript). Authors included several tables for quantitative parameters for several plants/several extracts. How are they obtained these parameters?</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:	Manoharan Karuppiah Pillai
Department, University & Country	University of Eswatini, Eswatini