

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_123601
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of phytochemicals in methanolic extract of <i>Hernandia peltata</i> Meisn. and assessment of their anti-inflammatory activity in silico
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	This study is a novel one. It provides a new dimension on the study of crude extracts. The study gets into the depth of the phytochemical in aspects such as docking.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The alternative title has been suggested in the adjacent column.	
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 is well written.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All subsections and structure are appropriate. However I suggest that the area on collection of material to be more elaborate.	
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.	The manuscript addresses phytochemicals which is primary source of drugs. The manuscript is addressing anti-inflammation a key area that requires scientific intervention. The methods employed are appropriate. Discussion is elaborate and well done.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are accurate and adequate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is quality and scientific sound.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is scientifically sound manuscript.  <b>Identification of Phytochemicals in Methanolic Extract of <i>Hernandia peltata</i> Meisn. and Assessment of their Anti-inflammatory Activity <i>in silico</i></b> <b>Phytochemical identification of Methanolic Leaf extract of <i>Hernandia peltata</i> Meisn and evaluation of anti-inflammatory activity in silico</b>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Boniface Maina Mwangi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kenyatta University, Kenya</b>