

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_127721
Title of the Manuscript:	Ficus exasperata (Vahl) plant: A brief review of its phytochemical properties and pharmacology
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The review provides a critical compilation of the phytochemical and pharmacological attributes of <i>Ficus exasperata</i> , emphasizing its potential in traditional and modern medicine. It is a valuable reference for ethnobotanists, pharmacologists, and researchers developing novel therapeutics.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title 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.	Add methodological specifics (e.g., data extraction and analysis methods). Include a summary of potential limitations. The aim to me seems like the methodology can frame it to look like the aim as shown in the document.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate. However, addressing discrepancies in toxicity findings and proposing standardized methods for future toxicological evaluations will enhance its impact. The authors can include more in-depth analysis of conflicting reports regarding the toxicity of <i>Ficus exasperata</i> to present a balanced perspective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Adequate but should be updated with recent studies, especially in toxicity and pharmacological applications. Still, the inclusion of more recent sources (post-2020) would increase the manuscript's currency.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical improvements are recommended. E.g Phytochemical components" section Original: Phytochemical analysis of the leaf, stem bark and root of <i>F. exasperata</i> shows the presence of tannins, flavonoids, saponins, phlobatannins and steroids, and an absence of alkaloids and anthraquinones. Improved: Phytochemical analysis of the leaf, stem bark, and root of <i>F. exasperata</i> showed the presence of tannins, flavonoids, saponins, phlobatannins, and steroids, with an absence of alkaloids and anthraquinones. Example 2. Original: This review serves as a collective reference for the researchers to take-up intensive toxicological evaluation and characterization of the toxicants present in <i>F. exasperata</i> extracts for its optimum therapeutic use. Improved: This review serves as a collective reference for researchers to undertake intensive toxicological evaluations and characterize the toxicants present in <i>F. exasperata</i> extracts for their optimum therapeutic use.	
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:	Esther Wairimu Kinyua
Department, University & Country	Lukenya University, Kenya