

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_123201
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of the Phytochemicals, Minerals, Antioxidant and Antimicrobial activities of Aqueous and Ethanolic extracts of Rauvolfia vomtoria leafs
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 is important for the scientific community as it contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the phytochemical, antioxidant, and antimicrobial properties of medicinal plants, specifically Rauvolfia vomitoria. By comparing the efficacy of aqueous and ethanolic extracts, the study offers valuable insights into solvent effectiveness for bioactive compound extraction, which is critical for developing herbal remedies and pharmaceutical applications. The manuscript could benefit from exploring unique aspects of Rauvolfia vomitoria to enhance its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Comparative Analysis of the Phytochemicals, Minerals, Antioxidant, and Antimicrobial Activities of Aqueous and Ethanolic Extracts of Rauvolfia vomitoria Leaves," is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, to make it more concise and impactful, I suggest an alternative title: "Phytochemical Profile and Bioactivity of Aqueous and Ethanolic Extracts of Rauvolfia vomitoria Leaves."	
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 generally comprehensive, but it could be improved by briefly mentioning the specific phytochemicals identified and their comparative concentrations in both extracts. Additionally, highlighting the key findings and their potential applications in pharmaceuticals or herbal medicine would provide more context and relevance to the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized, following a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it employs standard protocols and provides clear, well-supported results. However, the study could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the broader implications of its findings and a critical evaluation of its limitations to enhance its scientific contribution.	
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.	I appreciate the manuscript's clear presentation of data and its adherence to standard scientific methods. Enhancing the discussion with a deeper analysis of the implications of the findings and exploring unique aspects of Rauvolfia vomitoria would strengthen the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference not as per Journal Guidelines.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Improve the language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Title: Comparative Analysis of the Phytochemicals, Minerals, Antioxidant, and Antimicrobial Activities of Aqueous and Ethanolic Extracts of Rauvolfia vomitoria Leaves</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research Focus: The study focuses on comparing the phytochemical, mineral, antioxidant, and antimicrobial activities of aqueous and ethanolic extracts of Rauvolfia vomitoria leaves. 2. Significance of Findings: The paper reports differences in phytochemical contents and biological activities between the two extracts, highlighting ethanol as a better solvent for extracting biologically active molecules from Rauvolfia vomitoria. 3. Experimental Design: The study employs standard methods for phytochemical analysis, antioxidant assays, and antimicrobial testing. 4. Data Presentation and Interpretation: The results are presented clearly, with appropriate use of tables and figures. However, the discussion could be enhanced by providing a deeper analysis of the implications of the findings, especially concerning the traditional use of Rauvolfia vomitoria and its potential in modern medicine. 5. Contribution to Existing Knowledge: The paper contributes to the understanding of the comparative effectiveness of different solvents in extracting bioactive compounds from Rauvolfia vomitoria leaves. <p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The discussion should include a more comprehensive comparison with similar studies on other plants. Highlight what sets this study apart and discuss potential mechanisms for the observed differences between extracts. o Discuss the potential implications of the findings for drug development or other applications, linking them to broader research in the field. 3. Address Limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clearly state any limitations of the study, such as the geographical limitation of the plant source or the scope of microbial strains tested. o Suggest future research directions that could address these limitations or expand upon the findings. 4. Methodological Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Include a brief justification for the choice of phytochemical tests and antioxidant assays used in the study, explaining why they are most appropriate for the compounds of interest. o Consider including more advanced techniques, such as High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) for more precise quantification of phytochemicals. 5. Expand Literature Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The introduction and literature review could be expanded to include more recent studies that relate to the research topic, providing a more comprehensive background and highlighting the gap that this study aims to fill. 6. Clarity and Precision in Writing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure all scientific terms and methods are clearly defined and described for readers who may not be familiar with them. o Correct minor typographical errors and ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the paper. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Ashok H Akabari
Department, University & Country	Shree Naranjibhai Lalbhai Patel College of Pharmacy, India