

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_115068
Title of the Manuscript:	Qualitative and Quantitative Phytochemicals Screening of Aqueous, Methanol and Hexane Leaves Extracts of Senna occidentalis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? yes (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? yes (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? yes 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? yes 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? yes 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	COMMENTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT TITLED: Qualitative and Quantitative Phytochemicals Screening of Aqueous, Methanol and Hexane Leaves Extracts of Senna occidentalis 1. The article is poorly written in terms of sentence construction and review of literature 2. The plant is very well known and several pharmacognostic and phytochemical studies have already done with this species. 3. There are several spelling mistakes and errors in sentence construction, it seems the authors are not serious to write the article and to communicate in journal 4. The introductory parts should mention the traditional uses of the plants 5. The Result section lacks some technical parts mentioned in the text that needs clarifications 6. The discussion part should be more constructive. In present condition it seems authors are re-validating the results of the other workers for the same plant.	 Noted Done revision Amended
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? No		
Optional/General comments		

[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>	