

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
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

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.	<p>The article adds valuable information to the field of pharmacology and phytochemistry by identifying and characterizing the phytochemicals in <i>Hernandia peltata</i> and their potential anti-inflammatory properties. This could inspire further research and exploration of natural compounds for therapeutic use.</p> <p>The study bridges multiple disciplines, including botany, pharmacology, and computational biology. Publishing this work could foster interdisciplinary collaborations and inspire future studies that integrate these fields.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the article title is suitable	
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.	Abstract is well written	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Subsections are fine but Discussion in the manuscript need to be a little more elaborate especially on The toxicity assessments indicate potential mutagenic and carcinogenic properties of the compounds. The authors should discuss the implications of these findings in more detail, particularly in the context of therapeutic use. Citing references of previous similar studies in literature in discussion is needed. This would help contextualize the findings and highlight their significance." 	
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>The article adds valuable information to the field of pharmacology and phytochemistry by identifying and characterizing the phytochemicals in <i>Hernandia peltata</i> and their potential anti-inflammatory properties. This could inspire further research and exploration of natural compounds for therapeutic use.</p> <p>The study bridges multiple disciplines, including botany, pharmacology, and computational biology. Publishing this work could foster interdisciplinary collaborations and inspire future studies that integrate these fields.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference list is comprehensive, but some key studies on the pharmacological properties of <i>Hernandia peltata</i> and related species are missing. The authors should consider including these to strengthen their literature review.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is suitable	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gayathri S
Department, University & Country	Sathyabama Dental College and Hospital, India