

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_121888
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical evaluation and TLC Profile of Leaf and bark in Nyctanthes arbor-tristis L.
Type of the 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.	The research work on Phytochemical analysis and TLC on the said plant parts is an important work as this plant is used by many Aborigines in curing various ailments. The first step in any study of medicinal plant is to know its phytoconstituents which the author has tried to put forth.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is appropriate	
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.	There are grammatical mistakes in the abstract which makes it difficult to understand. Hence I suggest the author to rewrite the manuscript so that it is clear and any lay person can understand it.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well defined in proper sections and structure but due to grammatical mistakes it lacks the clarity.	
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 procedures mentioned are reproducible. Various solvent are used in determining the phytoconstituent which is also of great importance for study so that one knows the appropriate solvents that can be used for extraction. The Thin layer chromatography techniques if carried out using chemical markers would give the confirmed biomolecules present in the plants. .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some of the references quoted ex for heavy metal is not related to the study. The references for phytochemical analysis and TLC is missing.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is not suitable for Scholarly Communication. Even though the work is good the manuscript lacks the clarity due to low quality of language.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author needs to rewrite the manuscript without any grammatical mistakes.	

Review Form 3

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:	Bindu Gopalkrishnan
Department, University & Country	SVKM's Mithibai College, India