# **Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_110732
Title of the Manuscript:	Revealed State-of-the-Art Review of Phytochemical Content and Application from Cestrum nocturnum: Comparative Study for Physicochemical Aspect
Type of the Article	Review Article

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

## **Review Form 1.7**

#### **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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	YES.	
Is the manuscript important for scientific community?  (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	<ol> <li>Cestrum nocturnum may contain bioactive compounds with potential pharmaceutical or industrial applications. Understanding its phytochemical composition could lead to the discovery of new compounds with medicinal properties.</li> <li>If compounds with therapeutic effects are identified, it could have implications for the development of new drugs.</li> <li>Studying the plant's ecological role, habitat, and interactions with other organisms can contribute to our understanding of biodiversity and ecosystem dynamics.</li> <li>If the research involves comparative studies with other plants, it could provide insights into the unique features or properties of Cestrum nocturnum.</li> </ol>	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Comprehensive Review of Phytochemical Content and Applications from Cestrum nocturnum: A Comparative Analysis of Physicochemical Aspects"	
(ii not product outgets and allowed alloy	<b>Reason:</b> This revision aims to enhance the readability of the title by reordering and refining some of the phrases.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The information provided seems more detailed than a typical abstract, as it includes various aspects of Cestrum nocturnum, such as its common names, geographical distribution, ornamental and medicinal uses, cultivation methods, extraction techniques, phytochemical composition, and potential applications in biological screening. An abstract typically summarizes the key points of a research paper in a concise manner.  An abstract usually includes the following elements:  1. Background: Briefly introduce the plant and its significance.  2. Methods: Summarize the key methods used in the study (e.g., extraction techniques).  3. Results: Highlight the major findings or characteristics of Cestrum nocturnum.  4. Conclusion: Conclude with the implications or potential applications of the research.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	"While the manuscript shows promise, there are a few areas that need clarification or improvement. Specifically, applications of cestrum nocturnum and enhance its scientific accuracy."	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	"The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient, but there are some inconsistencies in the referencing format. It would be beneficial to maintain a uniform referencing style throughout the manuscript for clarity and consistency. Additionally, I recommend checking the recency of some references, especially in herbal industries and consider adding more recent studies to ensure the literature review reflects the current state of the field. I have noted specific instances of inconsistent	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	referencing in the review form."	
Minor REVISION comments	"Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. However, minor revisions may be needed in certain sections for enhanced clarity and coherence."	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Trowever, minor revisions may be needed in certain sections for enhanced clarity and conference.	
Optional/General comments		

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

### **Review Form 1.7**

# PART 2:

		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)
	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	,
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?		

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Khush Jain
Department, University & Country	D Y Patil University School of Pharmacy, India

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)