

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_127249
Title of the Manuscript:	MONOGRAPHY OF THE NEOCARYA MACROPHYLLA (Sabine) PLANT
Type of the 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.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it synthesizes traditional knowledge and contemporary scientific findings, offering new insights into the medicinal properties of <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> (Sabine) Prance ex F.White. The study highlights both the pharmacological potentials and the challenges associated with its use. This work is essential for guiding future research and exploring novel therapeutic applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally suitable, but a revision to emphasize the novel aspects of the study, as mentioned earlier, would enhance its impact. Full scientific name <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> (Sabine) Prance ex F.White. must mention in 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 abstract is concise but could benefit from more emphasis on the novelty of the research findings and their relevance to future studies. I suggest highlighting the specific gaps in the literature this review addresses.	Thanks for you
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript is well-organized, with clear subsections addressing key areas such as phytochemistry, pharmacology, and traditional uses. However, the section on toxicity could be expanded.	
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 sound and robust. It effectively summarizes key findings on the medicinal properties and chemical constituents of <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> , with appropriate references to support the claims. The methodologies and findings are well-presented, and the conclusions are based on solid evidence. Adding more detailed discussions on the mechanisms of action of the bioactive compounds would further strengthen the scientific quality.	thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly sufficient, but I recommend adding more recent studies, particularly those published in the last 2-3 years, to reflect the most up-to-date research on <i>Neocarya macrophylla</i> . I would also suggest including a few studies focused on the mechanisms of action for its key bioactive compounds.	thanks
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and readable, but there are some areas where the flow can be improved. Minor grammatical errors should be addressed to enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	<div><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Figures and Tables:</b> The figures and tables are appropriate, but the captions need to provide more context for readers. Consider revising them to ensure that they fully explain the content and relevance of the data presented.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion provides a good summary, but it would be beneficial to include suggestions for future research to broaden the scope of the study and indicate potential avenues for further exploration.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Toxicity Studies:</b> The section on toxicity is mentioned briefly. Expanding on this topic, especially concerning potential safety concerns, would make the review more comprehensive.</div>	

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)	