

### 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 Tetrastigma angustifolia (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> (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 study on <i>Tetrastigma angustifolia</i> in this manuscript exhibits therapeutic potential significant of this plant such as analgesic, anxiolytic and hypoglycemic effects. These findings are may be of potential utility in drug development. I liked manuscript for extensive study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
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.	This manuscript seems to be Scientifically correct. It is technically and scientifically seems to be robust. As proper study protocol is followed along with proper representation of data in tables and figures. It looks Research might have been done properly	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes,	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	it appears that lot of paraphrasing and restructuring of sentences have been done using some AI tools. Please reframe and restructure the sentences on own don't completely depend on AI tools.	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Niranjan D
Department, University & Country	Animal husbandry polytechnic konehalli, KVAFSU, India