

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_120902
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review about Barleria prionitis L.: A rarely known herb with potential Medicinal Properties
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 (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 manuscript described an herb of <i>Barleria Prionitis</i> Linn. which is not well studied. This herb is distributed widely throughout Asia and was believed to possess various phytochemicals with medicinal benefits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	No. The authors were suggested to provide a more comprehensive review on the topic by including more previous studies on the similar or related species. The authors should include original images instead of using those downloaded from online.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Most of the writing in point form and not much descriptions were provided.	
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.	The manuscript still needs much improvement to provide the technical evidences of the topic especially on the medicinal uses.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	More supporting information need to be included.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-	
Optional/General comments	Overall the manuscript was prepared in brief. Suggested the authors to perform a more thorough search and review on the manuscript before next submission.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Choy Yuen Khew
Department, University & Country	Swinburne University of Technology, Malaysia