

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_127249
Title of the Manuscript:	MONOGRAPHY OF THE NEOCARYA MACROPHYLLA (Sabine) PLANT
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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.	The study underscores a brief review about the significant pharmacological potential of <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> (Sabine), a plant widely utilized in traditional African medicine for treating various ailments. It is rich in diverse phytoconstituents, including flavonoids, tannins, terpenes, anthracenes, saponins, cardiogenic heterosides, and alkaloids. Notable active compounds also include chlorogenic acid, hyperoside, procyanidin B2, and other procyanidins. The literature highlights a range of pharmacological properties, such as antivenom, antimicrobial, analgesic, anti-inflammatory, anthelmintic, antidiabetic, and antioxidant activities of <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> plant. However, the plant also demonstrates toxicity potential at higher doses according to the literature review along with various pharmacological benefits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be more direct and straightforward to enhance the clarity of the manuscript's context. The author might consider titles such as " <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> (Sabine) plant: A brief review of its phytochemical properties and pharmacology	Thanks I will change title
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 article's abstract is comprehensive, providing a concise overview of the manuscript's content. However, the lack of connection between sentences disrupts the coherence and flow of the text.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate; however, proper alignment of the entire manuscript is necessary as it is currently inconsistent. Numerous spelling errors have also been identified and require correction. In the <i>Common Name</i> section, adding common names used in various local languages would enhance the list. Instead of the heading <i>Systematic Position</i> , the author might consider using <i>Taxonomy of the Plant</i> . Additionally, in the <i>Morphology of the Plant</i> section, the detailed characteristic features of various plant parts should be highlighted.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, providing a detailed account of the various phytoconstituents present in <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> and its potential for diverse pharmacological effects. It offers a valuable foundation for further research using plant extracts from different parts to address various ailments or mitigate toxicity and for treatment aspect.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficiently up-to-date; however, incorporating some additional review on the pharmacology as well as toxicity profiles of different extracts of <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> plant is recommended to further enhance the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Thoroughly proofread and edit the article for quality English language, especially spelling, grammar and ease of reading clearly. Spellings to be checked specifically.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript requires rewriting due to numerous grammatical errors and a lack of coherence between the lines. To attract a larger audience, it is essential to present well-crafted and high-quality literature.	THANKS FOR IT 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	