

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</a>               |
| 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. | Write the reasons why it is necessary to conduct research on the effect of extraction method on yield and Bioactivity of <i>Adenantha pavonina</i> .<br>In the Introduction section, it is necessary to write why use <i>Artemia salina</i> in toxicity (cytotoxicity) tests? |  |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)   | The title matches the contents of the article.  |  |
| 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 comprehensive.  |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | The manuscript has been written in accordance with scientific principles.   |  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              | The references consist of 13 that are more than 10 years old, 4 references from the last 10 years, and 4 references that are incomplete (without years). The author needs to add the latest references (last 10 years).   |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | The English used is quite good.   |  |
| <u>Optional/General</u> 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> |   |

#### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Slamet Mardiyanto Rahayu              |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Islam Al-Azhar, Indonesia |