



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_30052
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening , Spectrophotometric Determination of Total Carotenoids, Chlorophyll a and b Components of Crateva adansonii
Type of the Article	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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Results : Table 1: authors mentioned maximum and minimum absorptions which are -to my opinion- useless; it could be more interesting to show the amounts of pigments. Table 3: proteins and amino acids results of the screening are not mentioned. Discussion: this part is very weak. Authors just presented -again- the results without any explanation. This part lacks also the statistical study. Authors discussed solvents' efficiency including water and hot water, however organic solvents efficiency have been mentioned only in "the conclusion part"	We agree with you here. We have removed this tablebearing maximum and minimum absorption. So we have discarded maximum and minimum absorption. Table 2 which shows the amount of the pigments is now table 1 while table three is now table 2. We have removed potien and left amino acids in table 2 and the results of the phytochemical screening done clearly shown. We have strengthen the discussion part of this work
Minor REVISION comments	Generally, results found by authors are interesting. However, I strongly recommend statistical study to this paper. Certainly, when using correlations or different statistical tests interesting results will show up. Statistics always strengthen the discussion. Discussion should be redone with more precision and depth.	The discussion have been redone and more facts added. The statistical analysis done has been shown. The conclusion has also been redone
Optional/General comments		