

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_121799
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical testing methodologies and principles for preliminary screening/ qualitative testing
Type of the 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 <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Plant itself considered as a biosynthetic laboratory, it contains diversified class of phytochemicals, so phytochemical screening is important to understanding the therapeutic activity plants.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES, 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.	YES, Comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In section 2 subsections should be divide as 2.1 and 2.2.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically correct because identification of bioactive compounds is characterized through various qualitative and quantitative analyses that permit exploration into new pharmaceuticals and health supplements.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good.	
Optional/General comments	3.1.3.3 Legal's test and 3.1.3.4 Balget tests are comes under cardiac glycosides tests, so please add them under cardiac glycosides tests.	

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:	Sudhakar Kommu
Department, University & Country	Anurag Pharmacy College, India