



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_36546
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and nutrient composition of Pterocarpus erinaceus stem bark
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	L 23 – should be “an” important 29 – how did mineral content increased in plants recently? 31- the word should be “diet”. Better to revise that sentence 32-34 – revise the sentence L 33 – play a vital role in prevention and in curing diseases L 41 – revise the sentence L 51- why collected so long ago Give a brief description of the plant IS this plant is functional food plant?	It has been corrected in the manuscript We wrote that “Reports on the role of minerals (elements) present in plants have been on the increase in recent years” and not that the mineral content is increasing. This means that information in literature on the role of minerals present in plants has increased. “diet” has been corrected Sentenced has been revised Sentenced has been revised 2013 is a topographic error. The plant was collected in 2016. Correction has been effected in the manuscript. A brief description of the plant has been added: line 37-39 The plant is not consumed as food in this part of the world but it is used as animal feed.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		