

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_124581
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro Investigation of Phytoconstituents, GC-MS, TLC, Antioxidant activity, Total Phenolic & Flavonoid contents from leaves extract of Aegle marmelos L (Bael) Leaves
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The plant A. marmelos, studied here, has significant medicinal properties. Incorporating this plant into formulations could enhance the healthcare system. It is readily available in the subcontinent, and extensive research on its toxicology has been reported, suggesting that the final product will be cost-effective and associated with minimal side effects.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggestion "Phytochemical analysis and antioxidant activity of Aegle marmelos L. (Bael) Leaf Extract: An In Vitro Study Utilizing GC-MS and TLC Techniques for Total Phenolic and Flavonoid Quantification"	
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 requires improvement. It should begin with some background information on previous research instead of focusing on the plant's origin. Additionally, there are several typographical errors and instances of copy-paste mistakes that need correction. Furthermore, the findings regarding antioxidant activity are not mentioned and should be included.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Scientifically and technically the manuscript is not fully sound. Some information is missing in the abstract, while other details are absent in the Materials and Methods section (see Phytochemical Analysis).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The reference formatting does not comply with the journal's guidelines (see the Introduction section). Additionally, it is necessary to add or replace some references with more recent ones. Some suggestion are https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27393425/	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable; however, there are numerous typographical errors that need to be addressed.	
Optional/General comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hina Imran
Department, University & Country	Pharmaceutical Research Centre, Pakistan