

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_123640
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON MEDICINAL AND THERAPEUTIC PROPERTIES OF VERNONIA AMYGDALINA (bitter leaf)
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.	I liked the article, but I thought more work on the topic could be included. The use of natural compounds such as plant extracts and their secondary metabolites is very important and has been widely researched in health science. A robust review of the literature would be important to gather information about the application of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> in the treatment of various human diseases. However, few articles on the topic were included when more research is available in the literature, such as articles on antimicrobial application, while points that could be relevant topics, such as antiparasitic activity, were only commented on in another topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes. I suggest adding the databases used in the research and how many articles were included.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. The article would be easier to read if sections such as "DIETARY COMPOSITION OF <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> " and "TRADITIONAL USE OF <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> " were placed right after the topic "PHYTOCHEMICAL COMPOSITION" and before "CLINICAL RESEARCH AND THERAPEUTIC BENEFITS". There are also discordant font configurations in some subsections, such as "1. Anti-inflammatory effect" which is in lowercase, while "5. HEPATOTOXICITY EFFECT" is in uppercase. In the Anti-inflammatory effect section, paragraph indentation is not necessary and can be kept in the same configuration as the other paragraphs.	
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.	While the review topic is interesting, few articles were worked on in each topic, although there are recent articles available in the literature that would be pertinent as will be cited in the next review topic. In most topics, the authors present the main findings of the cited articles; however, topics such as "7. ETHNOPHARMACOLOGICAL PROPERTIES" could have the mentioned activities better described, directly referring to the research that evaluated them, as is present in the review article that referenced the entire paragraph. Likewise, the topic "TRADITIONAL USE OF <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> " cites antiparasitic activities that could be more detailed in an exclusive topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	No. With a quick search in databases using descriptors such as " <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> " and "bacteria" or "parasitosis" it is possible to locate current articles that would be interesting to add to the review, for example. DOI: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.1016/j.jep.2024.118601 • 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e17356 • 10.1186/s41182-023-00526-8 • 10.3389/fcimb.2023.1173138 • 10.1155/2022/9470178 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs Revisions.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Even though this is a mini-review, the article would benefit from a methodology section citing the databases used, inclusion and exclusion factors, and similar information used in the research and selection of articles, and from including this information in the abstract.</p> <p>Some minor grammatical revisions and reorganization of some sentences are necessary.</p> <p>The correct spelling of scientific names needs to be reviewed, since some are not in italics, including in the references.</p> <p>The graphs and tables presented are in low resolution; it would be interesting to improve their quality. It is also not clear whether these materials were taken from the original articles or created by the authors of this review. If the former is the case, it would be interesting to cite them in the figure caption.</p> <p>Author citations in the text should be standardized. In parts of the text, the citation appears freely in the text, such as "additional research from Nkono et al. (2022)", while in other parts it is in parentheses, as for example "Research from (Tokofai et al, 2021) [19] showed that".</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilza Wanessa Melo França
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil