SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Medicinal Plants**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJMP_54767**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Anticancer activity of Silver Nanoparticle by using Cassia auriculata**
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	**1.** Why choose *Cassia auriculata pla*nt? **2.** Your abstract should capture brief introduction of the problem, objective results and brief conclusion. **3.** There is no phytochemical screening of the plant and quantification of secondary metabolites that could have aided in nanoparticles synthesis. **4.** Your manuscript is full of grammatical errors with no flow. **5.** Where are your ftir spectrum, SEM, Uv-vis ad XRF because from my understanding tem only provides the size while XRD provides crystallinity? **6.** Why do you prefer using organic solvents in your synthesis?	Reason given in the introduction part of the manuscript and highlighted Done Done Done Done Done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	