

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_126991
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Profile and Bioactive Compounds in Aqueous Seed Extract of Irvingia gabonensis: 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

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.	Reasons for dislike: 1. The introduction is not so impressive. 2. The Methodology section is also unclear; it lacks technical details. 3. The basic theme of the manuscript is not new and seems to have been published already.	
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.	The abstract should contain the peak area percentage of some important compounds.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, appropriate	
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.	1. The methodology part – “2.4 phytochemical screening” section is unclear and lacks references. 2. The result part – “3. Result” section contains only the GCMS analysis results, as per the methodology phytochemical screening tests also have been done. So the result is shown in Table. 3. Discussion part- do not need a further subheading.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. Methodology references are not sufficient. 2. The “2.4 phytochemical screening” section has a very old reference (2002). Recent reference required.	
Minor REVISION comments	Require language corrections, spell check especially for chemical names.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	V. Thirumalai
Department, University & Country	Rajas Dental College and Hospital, India