

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_122751
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOPHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES AND IN-VITRO ANTIOXIDANT INDICES OF <i>Cnidoscolus aconitifolius</i> LEAVES
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the biophysicochemical properties and in-vitro antioxidant indices of <i>Cnidoscopus aconitifolius</i> (Chaya leaf), a plant with significant ethnobotanical importance. The study is particularly relevant for understanding the nutritional and therapeutic potential of plants harvested in specific geographical regions, which may differ in composition from those studied elsewhere. I appreciate this manuscript for its contribution to filling a gap in the literature by focusing on a lesser-known but culturally significant plant, which could inform future research and dietary planning.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "BIOPHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES AND IN-VITRO ANTIOXIDANT INDICES OF <i>Cnidoscopus aconitifolius</i> LEAVES", is appropriate and accurately reflects the study's content. However, a more concise alternative could be: "Biophysicochemical and Antioxidant Properties of <i>Cnidoscopus aconitifolius</i> Leaves".	
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 generally comprehensive, providing an overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However, it could benefit from mentioning the potential implications of the high moisture content and lower DPPH scavenging potential compared to ascorbic acid.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are well-organized and appropriate for a scientific article. The flow from introduction to methodology, results, and discussion is logical and coherent.	
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 appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodologies employed are standard and well-referenced, and the results are presented with appropriate statistical analysis. The discussion section effectively interprets the findings in the context of existing literature, highlighting the scientific significance of the results. The study's focus on a specific geographical region adds a layer of relevance that supports its scientific rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. A thorough proofreading and editing process is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript makes a meaningful contribution to the field by exploring the biophysicochemical properties and antioxidant potential of a plant with significant ethnobotanical relevance. The study is well-conceived and methodologically sound, with clear implications for dietary and therapeutic applications. Minor revisions to the abstract and language, would enhance the overall quality of the manuscript.	

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:	Prasad P.
Department, University & Country	Srinivas Institute of Technology, India