

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	Recent Developments in Chemistry and Biochemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3872
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Analysis and Antimicrobial Screening of Artocarpusaltilis: Guyana Flora Extracts
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work presents interesting results on the antimicrobial potential of plant extracts. I believe that these data can contribute to the literature, after reviewing the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I recommend reviewing the English writing again. The text also misspells words such as “essay” and “oxidant.” 2. I do not recommend using quotation marks and paraphrasing other works throughout the chapter. 3. Several scientific names are not in italics. 4. In the methodology, is cited that the plant residue is used to prepare the extract. What would this residue be and which part of the plant is being used? 5. The sentence “Antioxident, totalphenolic content and FTIR analysis of breadfruit methanolic leaves extract, which are essential in management of diabetes was demonstrated” by Leng et al” seems to be incomplete or out of place in the text. This is repeated a few times in other parts of the text, where the information does not seem connected. 6. Is the cultivation of the plant material subject to any type of monitoring or control? Are there any criteria for selecting the plant product used? 7. In the section on microbial tests, it is stated that different concentrations are tested using the unit of measurement “µL s”. Is this correct? 8. Why was the incubation time with the agents shorter in the disk diffusion method compared to the other methodologies? 9. Are the results presented in the table subtracted from the control? This is not clear in the text. 10. The numbering of the tables in the text is different from that presented in the text. 11. I recommend grouping the results according to the methodology used in the discussion. This makes it easier to read and compare the results. 12. Why was an aqueous extract used in the phytochemical tests and other solvents used in the antimicrobial tests? 13. Can the extractive capacity of methanol explain the results of the antimicrobial test? The text mentions that other studies also investigated similar extracts. Was the same solvent used? It is worth making a more in-depth comparison of the results obtained in this study with those reported in the literature 14. Can the differences obtained in the antimicrobial tests be related to the characteristics of each microorganism tested? 	

PART 2:

	<p><u>Reviewer’s comment</u></p>	<p><u>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)</u></p>
<p><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Otavio Augusto L. Dos Santos</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidade Federal Do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</p>