



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_50903
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Chemical Compositions of Two Different Non-polar Extracts of Heliotropium sudanicum Aerial Parts from Sudan
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The genus name of the plant should be mentioned in abstract. 2. Full form of GM/MS should be used in abstract. 3. The references should be mentioned in superscript in the text. 4. Elaborate the utility of non-polar extracts in modern medicine. 5. Add review of literature in discussion. 6. The references should be in accordance to Vancouver system. 	
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:	Shailja Puri
Department, University & Country	India