

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_122164
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Analysis, Antioxidant properties, Anti-nutrient Contents and Antimicrobial study of Aqueous Extract of Three Plants of Medicinal benefits
Type of the Article	

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 importance of this manuscript to the scientific community is highlighted as follows; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The medicinal plants understudied were able to prove therapeutic approaches in addressing global health challenges and promoting sustainable healthcare practices. 2. The phytochemical properties of the plant species can insight scientists develop innovative treatment approaches for chronic diseases and antimicrobial resistance. 3. The ease of access to these medicinal plants is essential for their preservation and the opportunity for further research on these plants. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Phytochemical analysis, Antioxidant properties, Anti-nutrient contents and Antimicrobial properties of Aqueous Extract of <i>Morinda lucinda</i> , <i>Solanum erianthun</i> , and <i>Dryopteris expansa</i>	
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 comprehensive; however, the authors should pay attention to italicizing the scientific (botanical) names of the medicinal plants.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 scientific correctness of this manuscript is itemized as follows; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is based on a well-defined research question: the authors were able to carry phytochemical analysis of the plants and still went further carry-out the antioxidants and antimicrobial investigations on the plant extracts. 2. The methodologies described in the manuscripts are well-detailed and answer the research questions. 3. The manuscripts also reflect the authors' diligence with a thorough review of relevant literatures. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The authors are advised to format the references in Vancouver style to match the manuscript write-up.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Akeem Olayinka Busari
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Mato Grosso Do Sul, Biological Sciences Institute, Brazil