

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_96069
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant, Anti-inflammatory and Analgesic Properties of Stachytarpheta angustifolia Mill Vahl (Verbenaceae) Methanol Extract
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:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	I read the manuscript interestingly and found some merits in it, although I have several queries:- The extracted plant material should be preserved with suitable reference number for future reference mentioned in the methodology section. Briefly describe the various Phytochemical Screening methods in the same section. Authors can deeply dive in the discussion by mentioning the phyto-constituents of the selected plant and can cite Bharti et al., 2018 "Antidiabetic phytoconstituents and their mode of action....". The quality of English is very poor and needs a native speaker. For animal model of work, "ethical consideration" is a must and it should be properly included in the manuscript. On what basis the various doses have been formulated? Abstract and conclusion should be more specific.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NEEDS IMPROVEMENTS	
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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudhanshu Kumar Bharti
Department, University & Country	B. N. College, Patna University, India