

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_124880
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative HPLC, Elemental, and Antioxidant Assay of Ipomoea aquatica and Telfairia occidentalis.
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.	It is a comparative analysis of the data between the Ipomoea Aquatica to Telfairia occidentalis in which it presents the data of antioxidant, minerals, and phytochemical composition of the plant. I like the concept wherein the author compares the plant as to the antioxidant and phytochemical analysis. However, I would like to know the output of the data if there is a significant value after it will be publish.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Comparative HPLC, Elemental, and Antioxidant Assay of Ipomoea aquatica and Telfairia occidentalis. Suggestion: Ipomoea Aquatica and Telfairia occidentalis: A comparative analysis on HPLC, Elemental and Antioxidant Assay	
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 research method should be emphasized 1-2 sentence is enough. Make sure to observe the proper grammar on each statement. The author should highlight the significant of the study to the possible reader or the impact of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, I have no comment on that.	
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 on Comparative HPLC, Elemental, and Antioxidant Assay of Ipomoea aquatica and Telfairia occidentalis appears scientifically sound and technically sound for several reasons. First, the use of HPLC (High-Performance Liquid Chromatography) ensures the precise separation and identification of bioactive compounds, which is essential for the accurate comparative analysis of these two plant species. Elemental analysis adds depth by providing insight into nutritional and mineral content, complementing the phytochemical profile obtained from HPLC. Finally, the antioxidant assay provides a clear evaluation of the health benefits of both species, supporting their relationship in nutrition and pharmacology. The integration of multiple analytical methods strengthens the reliability and comprehensiveness of the study's findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, it is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please enhance more the quality of the language used.	
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:	Lowelyn Q. Estoquia
Department, University & Country	North Eastern Mindanao State University, Philippines