



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_43993
Title of the Manuscript:	Botanical study, phytochemical screening and evaluation of the cytotoxicity of fruits of Solanum torvum Swartz (Solanaceae) on HFF cells (Human Foreskin Fibroblasts).
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>Manuscript title: The title of the manuscript is not satisfactory. Remove the words ...botanical study and use "phytochemical screening and evaluation of the cytotoxicity of the ethanolic extract of Solanum torvum Swartz fruit on human foreskin fibroblast". You did not study the botanical classifications.</p> <p>Line 4, use Abstract not Summary Line 14, keywords- Add phytochemicals</p> <p>The abstract should be recasted.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Line 15-Remove "1" Line 16-18 is not a good way to start an introduction. "contain important drugs" is a broad statement and should be avoided. Kindly recast. Line 19, in several treatment in Cameroun, what kind of treatment, please report. Line 23, also for the treatment of pain...? Recast line 23b – 31. Line 26, However...NOTE there have been studies in this regard.</p> <p>Remove the numbers, 2. Material, 1. Introduction, Summary and lot more numbering like 2.1.1, 2.1.2. Refer to the AUTHOR'S GUIDELINE for correction.</p> <p>Materials and methods</p> <p>Line 51-53, Remove 2.2.1 ...Botanical study and remove the references too. Line 62, whatman filter paper of what no.? Line 65 – 69, does not describe the preparation of 70% ethanolic extract. Using 5g of the aqueous extract on 100ml of 70% ethanolic does not describe that you used 70% ethanolic extract. Perhaps why would the author use an aqueous extract first and then ethanolic extract without pointing it and expounding the reasons for that. The two should not be interchanged. This is core scope of this research and it was missed.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 70, use phytochemical screening and not phytochemical sorting. For the phytochemical screening, kindly identify which of the extract was used and report accordingly. Also remove this phrase "to each plant extract" in all the phytochemical screening. Report properly, for reproducibility sack.</p> <p>Line 133, what is PBS. Write in full first.</p> <p>Kindly, present the toxicity test better for reproducibility sack. What is the source of the HFF used? Where is the source of the fruit?</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Remove line 143-173. Line 132- what are the different concentrations (0-1000 Y g/ml)? These concentrations were not seen in the result. 0-800 mg/l was seen. Line 180 - 182, use only English. What happened to the confluent cells? Was there no statistical analysis done for the values? Since the report said triplicate study was done. Line 197," treat anaemia". Kindly consider another word in place of treatment. Line 198 and 210 need references Line 211, at what concentration? Line 215, use alkaloids and not alkaloids.</p> <p>Present the phytochemical discussion first before that of the cytotoxicity.</p> <p>Recast the conclusion, point out the relevant findings from the conclusion.</p> <p>The references are okay. Remove ref. 6-9.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Just grammatical error	
Optional/General comments	<p>This article is generally vague, the author writes passively and there are lot of grammatical errors. The materials and methods use for this study were not properly reported, not reproducible nor robust. Consider the preparation of 70% ethanolic extract, It is totally wrong, when 5g of the aqueous extract in 100ml of 70% ethanol is reported to be the 70% ethanolic extract. Perhaps, This extract is too little for a study like this.</p> <p>The author should use the author guideline to effective so the revision.</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uchendu, Mbah Okuwa
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria