Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SARJNP_45603**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF ETHANOL AND AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF Annano muricata LEAVES.**
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)

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	**The manuscript entitled "PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF ETHANOL AND AQUEOUS EXTRACT OF Annano muricata LEAVES" investigated a phytochemical screnning and evaluates the microbicidal activity of the ethanolic and aqueous extract of *Annona muricata* against pathogenic bacteria. The paper includes some in vitro studies, and is easy to read.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The Introduction section is well organised; 2. Material and methods: 2.1: in the section **Sample collection and preparation**, which month and year were the plant species collected? In the section **Sample extraction**, the author does not describe the extraction method (eg: percolation, etc.) and does not describe obtaining the aqueous extract. **In phytochemical screnning**, the work cited (Sofowora, 1993) is not in the references. The authors could detail how phytochemical screnning was performed. Replace Test Organisms by microorganisms. In **Determination of Antimicrobial Activity** the work cited (Mitscher et al., 1972) is not in the references. Replace 10 ml by 10 mL. The authors cite that bacterial and fungal strains were used (name which fungal strain were tested). 3. Results and discussion (The authors do not mention how many times the experiments were performed, I suggest that at least triplicates be performed and the results be presented as mean and standard deviation.) The authors did not cite the figures in the results and discussion section, just as the figure captions need to be more elucidative about methodology and data. The microorganisms used were clinical isolates or some collection of microorganisms (eg ATCC). The scientific name of the microoganisms and plant species must be written in italics (check in whole paper). The tables do not contain the unit of measurement (eg mm). 4. Conclusion: the paper presents a different conclusion from the abstract. Justify how the work results led to these conclusions "The results Thus support the use of the plants traditionally to treat chronic diarrhea, fever, diabetes, malaria and suggest its usage in the formulation of new antibacterial drugs", and only evaluated the antimicrobial activity against some bacterial species.	Thank you Corrected Replaced Soforowa, 1993 and Mitscher, 1972 included in the reference
Optional/General comments	The paper presents scientific merit, but needs several corrections	Thank you

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)*	