

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 <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.	This manuscript explores the phytochemical properties of <i>Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</i> L., a plant with significant medicinal potential. The study is valuable as it contributes to the understanding of the bioactive compounds present in both the leaf and bark. However, the manuscript could benefit from clearer data presentation and more rigorous discussion of the results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate but could be made more concise. A suggested alternative is "Phytochemical Evaluation and TLC Profiling of <i>Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</i> L. Leaf and Bark Extracts." This title is clearer and more directly reflects the content of the manuscript.	
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 provides a good overview but contains some redundancy. The mention of emodin being absent is repeated, which could be streamlined. Additionally, the abstract could be improved by focusing more on the key findings and their implications rather than just listing results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is generally well-structured, but some subsections could be better organized. For instance, the methodology section could be divided into more distinct parts to improve readability, such as separating the extraction process from the phytochemical analysis.	
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 manuscript appears scientifically sound, with appropriate methods used for phytochemical screening and TLC analysis. However, some of the interpretations of the results, especially concerning the significance of certain compounds, need to be more thoroughly discussed. Clarifying these points would strengthen the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly adequate, but some are outdated. It would be beneficial to include more recent studies to provide a contemporary context for the research. Additionally, some references to foundational texts are necessary, but care should be taken to ensure a balance between older and newer sources.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript contains mistakes and awkward sentences that should be fixed to enhance clarity and readability. It is advisable to proofread. Furthermore, there are inconsistencies in the use of terms which may cause confusion among readers. Maintaining terminology is essential, for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	It is noteworthy and relevant to address this study to the field of phytochemistry. The manuscript, however, lacks depth on how the research findings relate to the existing knowledge on medicinal plants. Lastly, there is a possibility of improving the manuscript by adding graphical abstracts or summary figures to the current observation–	

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:	Yogesh R. Urdukhe
Department, University & Country	R. Bezonji Science College, India