

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_123809
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comprehensive Pharmacological Assessment and Phytochemical Analysis of <i>Tetragium angustifolia</i> (Roxb.) Deb.: Unveiling Analgesic, Anxiolytic, and Hypoglycemic Potential in Traditional Medicinal Contexts</b>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, the manuscript required language refining.</li> <li>• Use correct tense form wherever necessary. eg. The condition is linked to a reduced quality of life and, increases risk factors for death and injury [11] (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph)</li> <li>• Correct the spelling. Eg. A clean, round-bottomed flask (5 liters)- (under preparation of crude extract)</li> <li>• Mention how sample size are determined</li> <li>• Third last sentence in the second paragraph of introduction (“Insulin forms of diabetes.”) seems like incomplete.</li> <li>• In the second last sentence of second paragraph of introduction, it is said that, requirement for daily intravenous injections is needed in the case of insulin. Usually daily subcutaneous route is preferred in the case of insulin administration.</li> <li>• In section 2.2, (second last sentence) it is written as “Whitman” instead of whatman filter paper.</li> <li>• Acute toxicity test for the plant extract is not performed. Justification is needed for the selection of doses.</li> <li>• In the study design, the total duration of treatment is not mentioned. If the screening tests were carried out after a single administration of the plant extract, then the days of different tests conducted and also, the intervals between each test for different pharmacological activities are not mentioned. (Single group was served as standard for assessment of three different pharmacological activities as per the study design).</li> <li>• In the section 2.2 , the plant part taken for extraction is given as leaves; but in the section 3.1 ( 4<sup>th</sup> sentence) , it is mentioned as seed.</li> <li>• By contrasting the outcomes of different extract groups and with pertinent earlier publications, the discussion part should be enlarged.</li> <li>• Graphical representations do not contain error bars.</li> <li>• Conclusion should be more concentrated</li> <li>• Animal species should be in italics.</li> <li>• Acetic acid induced writhing methods were used to .....anxiolytic activity of Diclofenac. Is it anxiolytic activity</li> <li>• ‘<i>In vivo</i>’ should be mentioned in italics</li> </ul>	

**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>Litty Joseph</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mahatma Gandhi University, India</b>