

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_120261
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate, Selected Elements and Bioactive Compounds in <i>Jatropha tanjorensis</i> and <i>Bryophyllum pinnatum</i> 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:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 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 addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall comments While the paper has several strengths, particularly in its comprehensive data collection and relevance to ethnomedicine, it requires improvements in statistical analysis, consistency in data presentation, and deeper interpretation of the results. Addressing these weaknesses would significantly enhance the quality and impact of the manuscript.</p> <p>Methodology: Statistical Analysis Statistical methods should be described to validate the reliability of the results.</p> <p>Temperature and Duration Details Inconsistent detail about temperatures and durations (e.g., oven drying at 105 °C for 3 hours but no mention of how long samples are cooled in a desiccator for some procedures).</p> <p>GC-MS Operating Conditions While operating conditions for the GC-MS are mentioned, exact flow rate of helium could be more specific like at 1.0 mL/min.</p> <p>Clarity on Sample Preparation The process of air-drying and pulverizing the samples is mentioned but could be more detailed. It can be more detailed like exact drying conditions, whether in sunlight or shade.</p> <p>Elemental Analysis (Section 2.4) The procedure mentions "1g of each sample in a crucible was ashed," but does not specify the type of crucible used (e.g., porcelain, silica). Different materials may affect the results.</p> <p>Results Section The Results section is well-organized and presents the findings clearly through tables and figures. However, some areas need further clarification, and additional information could enhance the comprehensiveness and impact of the results.</p> <p>Statistical Significance There is no mention of statistical tests or significance levels (e.g., p-values) to support the findings. Including statistical analyses would validate the differences observed between the two plant species.</p> <p>Consistency in Units Ensure consistency in reporting units across the tables. For instance, if using percentages for mineral content, maintain this format throughout to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Interpretation of Data Some results are presented without sufficient interpretation or discussion. For instance, higher moisture content in <i>B. pinnatum</i> is mentioned but not discussed in terms of its implications.</p> <p>Figure Legends The legends for Figures 3 and 4 could be more detailed, explaining what each peak represents and how to interpret the chromatograms.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shreejana K C</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Montana State University, USA</p>