

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_124421
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterize and elucidate the structure of tannins present in the seed of <i>Telfairia occidentalis</i>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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.	Yes, the topic is interesting, but no application is defined in it, and it is only to identify and specify the structure .Even it is better to read more articles to make the article more comprehensive. I have announced my comments below.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is better to change the title of the article by the respected author because the idea and thought are his and the related articles that he has reviewed can help them.	
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 arrangement of the summary is good, but it would be better if the writing and phrasing were changed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>A good introduction about tannins and their use has been stated.</p> <p>According to the last part of the introduction, it has been said about the work on the properties of flavonoids, but not much has been said about the research about tannins. Previous studies have focused on the characterization of flavonoids in <i>Telfairia occidentalis</i> [36]</p> <p>Certainly, studies and researches have been conducted in this field and each of them have obtained results, none of which have been mentioned here. I suggest you use the studies and experiences of other researchers and bring them here. Then tell about your work and mention the difference between your work and other researches and explain the importance of your work.</p> <p>The arrangement of the Materials and Method in the experimental part is good, but it would be better if the type of writing and phrasing were changed a little. In general, it is more similar to a laboratory work report.</p> <p>The Results and Discussions is also very short and concise. Other complementary analyses could be used and at the same time, they could be used according to the applications that were mentioned.</p> <p>Mathematical formulas and expressions are not written scientifically.</p> <p>The Conclusion is also very short.</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.	Altogether, the sentences are appropriate and scientifically a good work has been done. But other complementary analyses could be used and at the same time, they could be used according to the applications that were mentioned.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are new references. But as it was said in the previous section, it is better to add the sources related to the relevant research (research background).	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The sentences are appropriate.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No special figure or diagram is used in the introduction. Only the figure related to tannins is available. It is better to include figures from the work steps.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saeideh Hosseini</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Iran</b>