

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)
<p>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>	<p>The manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it provides a detailed phytochemical analysis of <i>Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</i> L., a plant with well-known medicinal properties. The study's use of Thin Layer Chromatography (TLC) to identify and profile various bioactive compounds adds value to the existing knowledge on the plant's therapeutic potential. I appreciate the manuscript for its thorough approach to evaluating both the leaf and bark, offering insights that could inspire further research into natural remedies. However, the manuscript could benefit from more discussion on the implications of the findings for pharmaceutical development.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article, "<i>Phytochemical evaluation and TLC Profile of Leaf and Bark in Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</i> L." is suitable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it effectively summarizes the key objectives, methods, and findings of the study. It provides an overview of the phytochemical evaluation and the use of Thin Layer Chromatography (TLC) to profile the bioactive compounds in <i>Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</i> L. However, a few improvements could make it more impactful:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highlighting the Significance: Adding a sentence or two about the broader implications of the findings for pharmaceutical or medicinal applications could strengthen the abstract. 2. Results Specificity: Including specific results, such as the most significant phytochemicals identified or any notable differences between the leaf and bark, would provide more clarity. 3. Conclusion: A brief concluding remark on the potential uses or future research directions could be included to give the abstract a more rounded finish. <p>Overall, the abstract is solid but could be enhanced with these additions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Many researchers are actively conducting research on this plant to develop new drugs. Therefore, I suggest that the author add a section on the future perspectives, particularly focusing on new drug development related to this plant.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and robust due to its thorough methodology and detailed analysis. The use of well-established techniques like Thin Layer Chromatography (TLC) for phytochemical profiling ensures the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the manuscript carefully controls variables such as solvent selection, which is critical in accurately identifying and quantifying bioactive compounds. The clear presentation of results, supported by tables and discussions, further strengthens the scientific validity of the study. These factors contribute to the manuscript's technical soundness and overall credibility.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the document appear to be largely sufficient and relevant to the subject matter.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is written in clear and understandable English, with appropriate use of scientific terminology and a logical flow of ideas. However, if author wants to modify / advanced sentence, it's better.	
Optional/General comments	It is suggested that the author mention the future development possibilities through this plant, particularly as a source for new drugs. Figures are not clear, requested to author please add clear images.	

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:	Manmath Kumar Rout
Department, University & Country	India