

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_125050
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE, MINERAL CONTENT DETERMINATION AND PHYTOCHEMICAL ASSESSMENT OF A FORMULATED HERBAL TEA FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF MALARIA INFECTION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript makes a significant contribution to the scientific community by providing novel insights that could greatly enhance our understanding of a specific area. It is well-structured, and the sound methodology enhances its reliability. However, the discussion section would benefit from better contextualization of the results within the existing literature to improve its overall impact. Overall, I consider this study promising and valuable for advancing knowledge in the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is quite descriptive and accurately reflects the content of the study. However, it could be streamlined for clarity and impact.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title: "Phytochemical, Mineral, and Proximate Analysis of Herbal Tea Formulated for Malaria Management"</p> <p>This alternative title maintains the essential elements of the original while making it more concise and easier to read.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the manuscript provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, and results, but there are several areas where it could be improved for clarity and comprehensiveness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <p>Clarity and Structure: The abstract can be structured better to improve readability. Consider breaking it into distinct sections (e.g., Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusion).</p> <p>Minor Language Corrections:</p> <p>Correct typographical errors, such as "preparationsin" to "preparations in", "teas" in the first sentence and "productionhas" to "production has, in the second line."</p> <p>Ensure consistent formatting for measurements (e.g., "ppm" for parts per million and proper spacing around units in some places).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and follow a logical flow.</p> <p>However, a few structural improvements could enhance readability:</p> <p>The introduction could benefit from clearer transitions between the different topics covered, especially when moving from global statistics to specific studies. Consider using subheadings or paragraphs to delineate different themes. Ensure that all claims are backed up with appropriate citations, and double-check that references are correctly formatted.</p> <p>In Materials and Methods section, Organization is required in this section as it might help to organize this section into clear subheadings (e.g., Sample Preparation, Phytochemical Analysis, Proximate Analysis) for easier navigation.</p> <p>In Results and Discussion Section, Consider separating the results and discussion into distinct sections. This would clarify the presentation of findings and subsequent interpretation. Try to use more visuals (graphs, charts) to present data where applicable, especially for trends or comparisons. Ensure tables are clearly labelled and easy to interpret. In table 3 instead of "Concentration PPM" it may be used as Concentration (ppm). Expand on the implications of findings in a broader context, including how they compare with existing literature. Discuss limitations of the study and potential areas for future research.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor and technical reliability through a comprehensive methodology and robust experimental design, ensuring replicability and validity. The thorough data analysis employs appropriate statistical methods, leading to credible conclusions. Furthermore, the discussion situates the findings within existing literature, highlighting their significance and contribution to the field. Overall, the manuscript upholds high standards of scientific inquiry and enhances knowledge in its research area.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and up-to-date, providing a solid foundation for the research.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's language is generally appropriate for scholarly communication, featuring clear expression and suitable terminology. However, minor improvements in phrasing could enhance clarity and flow. A thorough proofreading would address any grammatical issues and awkward constructions, ensuring the manuscript meets academic writing standards. With some revisions for clarity and conciseness, the manuscript will be ready for publication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript offers a thorough examination of its research topic, showcasing a strong grasp of the subject. The authors have organized the content well, leading readers clearly through their methodology and findings. However, some areas, especially in the discussion section, would benefit from additional elaboration to better contextualize the results. Furthermore, clarifying specific terms and concepts could enhance accessibility for a wider audience. Overall, the manuscript contributes meaningfully to the field and is ready for publication with minor revisions.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Surajit Bhattacharjee</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bodhjung H. S. School, India</p>