

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_126983
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Profile and Bioactive Compounds in Aqueous Leaf Extract of Anacardium occidentale: A GC-MS Analysis
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>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript will enrich the previous findings</li> <li>2. But, this manuscript needs more data and discussion</li> <li>3. More data to explain GC-MS</li> </ol>	
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.	Not enough Please add the % similarity data	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Please improve See the notes	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Follow the guidelines of the journal</li> <li>2. Improve the table</li> <li>3. Add more discussion</li> <li>4. Add more references</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not enough Please check the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	Suitable, but needs improvement	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript within the scope of the journal	

### 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:	Kosasih
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pancasila, Indonesia