



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 (Capparaceae) 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	<p>In row 7 at abstract pH not P^H Keywords are usually arranged in alphabetical</p> <p>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 day In row 340 pH not P^H In row 345 microorganism not micro-organism, providing not proving</p>	
Optional/General comments	There are 10 from 37 references not up to date (more than 10 years)	

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:	Maria Bintang
Department, University & Country	Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia