

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_114329
Title of the Manuscript:	Outline of the pharmacological and phytochemical profile of the jungle jalebi (Pithecellobium dulce)
Type of the Article	The scientific research paper

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the papaer provides new and significant information adequate to justify publication. Research question, empirical analysis and context of application are interesting for improving academic and practical debate.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate and attractive.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is appropriate and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct and has no problems.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and new</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the quality of the language/English of the article is suitable and expressive for scientific communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This article provides an interesting analysis and provides significant insights The methodology is well developed and the methods used are appropriate. The results are clearly presented and properly analyzed. The conclusion is well related to the elements of the essay. Communication quality is good.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Somayeh Sattari Alamdar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Islamic Azad University, Iran</b>