

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126782
Title of the Manuscript:	ECOLOGICAL STUDY AND PHYTOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> IN THREE SELECTED STATES OF SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Research 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>

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 holds significant value for the scientific community, especially in phytochemistry and ethnobotany , as it provides valuable insights into the chemical composition and ecological variation of <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> across three states of Southeastern region of Nigeria.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and informative and reflects on the overall work done.	
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 is concise, but I suggest a few revisions to improve its clarity and brevity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is generally well-structured, but I recommend minor adjustments for improved flow and to clarify some methodological details. In materials and methods sample area description was given but there is no map of the study area? In sample collection, show some photographs of sample and its collection from study area. Photographs related to phytochemical analysis of the samples, confirmation tests could have been added for more scientific clarity.	
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 is scientifically robust, and the methods and results are solid. The phytochemical analysis and ecological study follow appropriate techniques, making the findings reliable. The Results and Interpretation part is accurate and the data presentation is clear and appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references appear mostly sufficient but could be updated with more recent studies to ensure the manuscript reflects the latest developments in the field. For reference no.65, article title is not given. Neelam Yadav , Showkat Ahmad Ganie , Bijender Singh , Anil K Chhillar , Surender Singh Yadav: 2019. Phytochemical constituents and ethnopharmacological properties of <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> L. <i>Phytother Res</i> ;33(9):2163-2178.doi: 10.1002/ptr.6405.	

Review Form 3

	<p>Ara, Ngo Biyiha Marilyn Orlane, Estella Tembe Fokunang, Tabi Yves Omgba, Njinkio Nono Borgia Legrand, and Fokunang Charles Ntungwen. 2024. "Phytochemical Screening of Ageratum Conyzoides L. (Asteraceae) Aerial Parts". <i>South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</i> 7 (3):212-26.</p> <p>Ibrahim, M. A., et al. (2020). "Phytochemical and pharmacological profile of Ageratum conyzoides." <i>Journal of Ethnopharmacology</i>, 250, 112435.</p> <p>Dharmaraj, S., et al. (2021). "Recent advancements in phytochemical screening of medicinal plants from the Asteraceae family." <i>Phytochemistry Reviews</i>, 20(2), 345-365.</p> <p>Williams, T., et al. (2019). "Ecological variation of Ageratum conyzoides in tropical environments: Implications for species management." <i>Global Ecology and Biodiversity</i>, 28(11), 1345-1358.</p> <p>Zhang, Y., et al. (2020). "Species diversity and ecological interactions of invasive species in subtropical environments." <i>Journal of Vegetation Science</i>, 31(2), 234-246.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	I've suggested some minor revisions to improve the clarity of the manuscript, refine the introduction, and provide additional details in the materials and methods section. Check for the typographical mistakes in the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chaya Pallati
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India