

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_128724
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of extraction method on yield and Bioactivity of Adenantha pavonina
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript shows that <i>Adenanthera pavonina</i> can be a potential resource that can be used in various industries. Thus, it has values that can shed light on future studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	'Potential Effect of Soxhlet and Ultrasound-Assisted Solvent Extraction Methods on the Bioactivity of <i>Adenanthera pavonina</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 of the article can be improved with the numerical values obtained. In addition, differences or similarities due to extraction methods should be stated.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient. In particular, the results are not discussed and compared with other studies in the literature. In addition, the method should be supported by references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Article language is sufficient.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has original value but its original value has not been sufficiently expressed. The reasons for the differences arising from the extraction method need to be determined. As mentioned before, comparison with literature studies is of great importance. Statistically evaluated data should be presented appropriately. Sources are insufficient and should be supported with current sources. The manuscript should be improved.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Saglam
Department, University & Country	University of Aksaray, Türkiye