

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_121184
Title of the Manuscript:	“The Pharmacological Properties of Cola nitida Phytochemicals: Implications for Cancer Therapy Development”
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The use of natural chemicals in cancer therapy is a promising field of research as more is discovered about the complexities of cancer and the mechanisms of potential treatments. A few of these phytochemicals are naturally occurring physiologically active substances with strong anticancer properties. Clinical trials using phytochemicals against cancer are still in their infancy, even though an overwhelming number of anti-cancer molecules are currently being developed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Phytochemistry and pharmacological properties of <i>Cola nitida</i> : Implications for cancer treatment	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive If consider the abstract to be a sequence of complete sentences that describe the most important information with the fewest number of words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate. Some changes are suggested, like the botanical word Cola nitida should not be written like this, you could change the word in italics to <i>Cola nitida</i> and remove numbering in the conclusion	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is critical to experiment with novel review formats that promote transparency, which will eventually improve scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	To enhance the manuscript's scientific significance, consider including recent studies (within 5 years) on pharmacological studies, and cancer therapy.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are appropriate for scholarly communication. The manuscript uses clear and logical academic language to effectively express the study's aims, procedures, findings, and consequences.	
Optional/General comments	I congratulate the writers on conducting an outstanding study and presenting it. I have provided comments in the paper, which I hope the authors will examine and alter.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P. Kalaivani
Department, University & Country	Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, India