

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_126416
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Compounds by HPLC-ESI- Q-TOF -MS/ MS Analysis of the Ethyl Acetate fraction of Hyptis suaveolens leaves before Essential Oil extraction
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.	In my opinion, the topic of research is relevant, because the chemical composition of many plants is still poorly studied, and it is also advisable to search for new sources of antioxidant herbal medicines. The research results are a significant contribution to science, because eight described compounds had not been identified during previous studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is 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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive. In my opinion, the abstract does not need to be corrected.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The text of the article is laid out consistently, scientifically and as clearly as possible.	
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.	In my opinion, the manuscript contains the results of original research and is scientifically correct. The authors used modern research methods to conduct the analysis. The authors provide a detailed description of the research. The article contains a sufficient number of schemes and illustrations necessary for understanding.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not all references are recent. Part of the used literature sources (approximately 50%) were published more than ten years ago.	
Minor REVISION comments	The quality of language of the article is acceptability for academic publication.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	1) It should be better named all identified compounds according to nomenclature of IUPAC. 2) It is better to indicate the names of identified compounds for the all descriptions of the figures, which shown the structural formulas of the identified compounds (like as Figure 8: Structure of compound 3 (quercetin)/ 3) It is desirable to add information in the introduction how the identified compounds can be useful for the treatment of diseases caused by oxidative stress. 4) Furthermore, it should be better to add in the references list sources have been published recently, such as the last 5 to 10 years.	

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:	Viktoriia Protska
Department, University & Country	National University of Pharmacy, Ukraine