

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.	This manuscript has significant value for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in our knowledge of these three plants. By presenting novel insights and robust data, it contributes to the advancement of knowledge and may inspire further research in this field. I appreciate this manuscript for its clear methodology and thorough analysis, which provide a solid foundation for future studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Better to list down all three plant species instead of "three plants". "Three plants" is too general	
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.	A lot of typos for species name. Some of the species are not italic. For keywords, antimicrobial resistance was included, however it is not related with the abstract. Better to replace with antimicrobial activities or properties	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its detailed methodology and thorough experimental design. Additionally, the manuscript is well-structured, with clear, logical arguments that are supported by data. The depth of literature review and the authors' critical engagement with previous studies also strengthen the manuscript's scientific credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some of the sentences need English checking	
Optional/General comments	A lot of typos such as 1. There is not gap between number and unit eg: 10mg 2. Some of the species name is not italic	

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:	Tuan Nadrah Naim Tuan Ismail
Department, University & Country	Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia