

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SARJNP_121379</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>COMPARATIVE PHYTOCHEMICAL, GC-MS, PROXIMATE, MINERALS AND VITAMINS COMPOSITIONS OF 95% ETHANOL LEAF EXTRACTS OF GONGRONEMA LATIFOLIUM AND OCIMIUM GRATISSIMUM.</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 plant material have different chemical compounds and physical properties. Those chemical compounds are used for treated different disease or illness and used for other applications. The traditional physicians are used many plants for different disease. However, they don't know about the dosage, the chemical compounds inside the plant and other properties. So therefor, this kind of research is very important for drug developers and other traditional physicians to fulfil their gapes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Needs a little modification <b>COMPARATIVE PHYTOCHEMICAL, GC-MS, PROXIMATE, MINERALS AND VITAMINS COMPOSITION ANALYSIS OF GONGRONEMA LATIFOLIUM AND OCIMIUM GRATISSIMUM LEAVES EXTRACTS.</b>	
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.	It is not comprehensive The phrase "significantly (P<0.05) higher" is repeated many times. It may decrease the attractiveness of the abstract. The author should be modify and rewrite it.	
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.	The manuscript is well organized and It is scientifically sound. No need of other suggestion. The question and recommendations are provide in the other comment section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is not enough. Because, the authors rise many ideas like phytochemicals, gc-ms, proximate, mineral and vitamin analysis. For each of them or each methods of analysis needed references. The author should support each method by reference.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	partly	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The authors claim to have identified 38 and 37 main compounds for each plant from the GC-MS analysis, but fail to provide a comprehensive discussion on the fragmentation patterns and mass spectra of these compounds. Specifically, the authors should provide a detailed explanation of the ionization and fragmentation mechanisms that led to the identification of these compounds</li><li>2. The authors fail to provide any information on the potential toxicity of the two plant extracts, including their cytotoxicity, Geno toxicity, and mutagenicity. It is crucial to provide this information to understand the safety profile of these extracts for human use.</li><li>3. List of chemicals and equipment is not listed properly; the author should include/ list all the chemical and equipment's with standards.</li><li>4. What are the relationship between, phytochemicals, vitamin and mineral study for this article?</li><li>5. Why the author doing vitamin and mineral analysis rather than anti-microbial activity. To study the medicinal activity of the plant material anti-microbial activity test is very important.</li></ol>	

### 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:	Yassin Adem Endris
Department, University & Country	Wollo University, Kombolcha Institute Technology, Ethiopia