

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_124581
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>In vitro Investigation of Phytoconstituents, GC-MS, TLC, Antioxidant activity, Total Phenolic &amp; Flavonoid contents from leaves extract of Aegle marmelos L (Bael) Leaves</b>
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)
<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><b>The author can take the help of following references.</b>            1-Evaluation of antioxidant activity, quantitative estimation of phenols and flavonoids in different parts of Aegle marmelos. Nadeem Ahmad Siddique, Mohd Mujeeb, Abdul Kalam Najmi and Mohd Akram. Article Number - 8F7047F11260            Vol.4(1), pp. 001-005 , January 2010. <a href="https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPS.9000110">https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPS.9000110</a>            2- DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY STANDARDS OF AEGLE MARMELOS L. LEAVES. <a href="#">N. SiddiqueM. MujeebS. AnsariSayeed AhmadB. AliJ. Aslam</a>            Medicine, Environmental Science, 2010            3-Quantitative analysis of phenols, flavonoids in different parts of Aegle marmelos (Bael) along with the evaluation of Antioxidant potential using different extracts <a href="#">Tanya DhandaV. MadanR. Beniwal</a>            Environmental Science, Medicine. 2020            The manuscript requires substantial editing for clarity and conciseness. Several sections are verbose and contain grammatical errors. Simplifying complex sentences and removing redundant phrases will improve readability. There appear to be sections with potential overlap with existing literature. The authors are advised to rephrase these sections and ensure all sources are properly cited.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></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 claims regarding the GCMS efficacy of the extracts are not fully supported by the data presented.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Sections of the introduction and literature review could be shortened by focusing on the most relevant background information.            The discussion section could be improved by more thoroughly comparing the results with previous studies.</p>	
<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 statement regarding the availability of raw data has been included.            The objective of the study clearly elaborated in the manuscript.            GCMS technique for extraction as an advance technique. The phytochemical screening and elucidation has been carried out by GCMS. That gives the comparable results to HPLC or GC-MS data.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.            =</p>	<p><b>The author needs to be recheck the manuscript to use standard basic principles of writing manuscript.</b></p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Results obtained are not elucidated in ease understandable way The concepts are not clear to audience for reading/understanding purpose The discussion section could be improved by more thoroughly comparing the results with previous studies. The authors should critically evaluate their findings against existing data	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors are advised to rephrase these sections and ensure all sources are properly cited. <b>The author needs to be recheck the manuscript to use standard basic principles of writing manuscript.</b> Please provide a more detailed explanation of how the extraction conditions were selected and optimized. The statistical analysis requires additional clarification. Please specify the exact parameters tested, the number of replicates, and the methodology used for the ANOVA test. Including details on confidence intervals and p-values for each comparison would be beneficial. Hence more details in the Materials and Methods, particularly regarding the statistical methods used and the rationale for selecting specific extraction conditions have to be provided.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nadeem Ahmad Siddique</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>