

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_85188
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and Essential Oil Characterization of the Aerial Parts of Leonurus cardiaca (Motherwort)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In this manuscript, the authors explored Leonurus cardiaca using HPLC and other techniques. Considering the effort that has been done to explore it in detail, and the promising results which could indeed be used by others in the field, I believe that the manuscript well suits the journal.</p> <p><u>However</u>, I still have two major concerns about this manuscript and they can be found below:</p> <p>1) Firstly, the authors should carefully revise the manuscript as there are countless grammar and format errors, such as repeating paragraphs (see Introduction), missing sections (e.g. Section 2.1), wrong references (such as [337] ?). Furthermore, there are several explanatory parts that should have been in the introduction, but they appear in the results section!</p> <p>2) Second, it would make more sense to explain in detail in which applications each chemical in Leonurus cardiaca will be used, rather than repeating "various diseases" several times throughout the manuscript. The authors should discuss and clarify which chemicals carry the greatest potential to treat which disease. The authors should also discuss what is the advantage of Leonurus cardiaca compared to its many alternatives.</p> <p>The manuscript should be accepted only after these two major changes are made since I find those very troubling.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Baran Teoman
Department, University & Country	New Jersey Institute of Technology, United States