



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_54737
Title of the Manuscript:	Extraction of Phytochemical Compounds of <i>Leea guineensis</i> (G. Don) leaves Using Non-Polar and Polar solvents
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authors have discussed about the presence of 8 phytochemicals in the G. Don <i>leaves</i> extract but have not mentioned any isolation processes for each of the phytochemicals. Authors have also not mentioned about the overall phytochemical pattern of that particular leaf extract. The result need some supporting data HPLC or LCMS. 2. Author should mention the efficiency of extraction with respect to all solvents reported and should compare the data with commercial relevance. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quantitative estimation procedure should be mentioned in the text. 2. Author should clearly mention the solvent characteristics (b.pt, polarity, purity), percentage of solvent used and should provide a clear correlation of the observation with solvent characteristics 3. Author should mention the importance of the study in present context. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is well organised and overall presentation is also very good but scientific importance is not properly highlighted. Importance of the work and its deliverables should be incorporated in the revised manuscript. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ranjana Das
Department, University & Country	Jadavpur University, India