Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_51549**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Phytochemical Screening, Elemental and Proximate Analysis of Maerua angolensis (Capparaceaea) Stem Bark**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**This manuscript is good in its contents and composition, only needs a little improvement**	
Minor REVISION comments	**In row 7 at abstract pH not P^H** **Keywords are usually arranged in alphabetical** **In row 91 angolensis, not Angolensis** **In row 107 how many mesh powder particle size** **In row 123 stable foam for 10 minutes and add 1 ml HCL 2M, the foam persistent stable** **In row 129 This title move to the following page, do not separate from the content** **In row 142 not small amount but 8 drops** **In row 154 and then inject to HPLC** **In row 186 This title move to the next page, do not separate from the content** **In row 159 This table moves to the next page, don't separate** **and I recommended that letters in the contents of all Tables must be smaller than the text** **In row 234 Folklore not follelore** **In row 253 Ceruloplasmin not cerulosmin** **In row 295 Intracolonic not tracolonic** **In row 311 Too much ??? child needs approximately 18 – 20 grams protein per dayIn row 340 pH not P^H** **In row 345 microorganism not micro-organism, providing not proving**	All the observed corrections were effected
Optional/General comments	**There are 10 from 37 references not up to date (more than 10 years)**	Some were not revised because they are cited to support methods of analysis

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)*	