

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_117022
Title of the Manuscript:	Phyto-constituents of the Ethanolic Extracts of the Bulbs of selected genera in the family Amaryllidaceae
Type of the Article	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.journalaprij.com/index.php/APRJ/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 The manuscript is important for the scientific community The title for the article is suitable The abstract of the article is somewhat lengthy. One statement is repeated, kindly look into it The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate The manuscript is scientifically correct The references are recent and sufficient The font size and font style in the entire article is not uniform and is different.	 The authors have taken care of the reviewer's comments appropriately
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	 Thank you
Optional/General comments	 The font size and font style in the entire article is not uniform and is different.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	