



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_21822
Title of the Manuscript:	Elemental Composition and Phytochemical Studies of Aqueous Leaf Extract and Stem Bark Extract of <i>Crateva adansonii</i>
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<i>Crateva adansonii</i> The plant name should be in italic. In many cases it is not written in italic font. 2.1 Collection and preparation of samples Plant authentication reference number is not provided in article. The procedure for preparation of extract is not mentioned clearly. Whether powdered leaf and bark is used or entire dried leaves and stem cutting. Stem and stem bark, both are different part. Author has used stem cutting instead of stem bark. It is confusing... 2.2 Phytochemical screening The chemical test for different constituents should be mention separately. Not in a single paragraph. 2.3. Quantitative test for elemental composition For elements measurement, the sample used as such or after performing some processes on it. Author has not provided detail procedure of Quantitative test for elemental composition. The author has provided general operation of atomic absorption spectrophotometer.	We have rewritten the plant in italic 2.1. The plant authentication number is UNN/H/67 Powdered leaf and stem bark extracts were used. We have corrected this. 2.2. We have separated the test in separate paragraphs 2.3. The samples were first processed before being used. We have corrected it in the article. The samples were first digested. We have also specified the operation of atomic absorption spectrophotometer. Flame atomic absorption spectrophotometer was used.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	2.4. Statistical method Mention the name of software by which statistical analysis was done.	The statistical software used is :IBM SPSS version 21. We have stated this in the article
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	---	