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* plant? 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?	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Augustine Nyabola*
Department, University & Country	*Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya*