

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	

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)	Yes, as it covers many plants for their constituents. Furthermore, their biological and pharmacological activities are also mentioned which are very useful to treat many diseases. Yes Yes No, Table 2 should be included in introduction or Literature review. Yes Sufficient but NOT recent.	The Comments have been duly noted and attended to appropriately
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Thank you
Optional/General comments	Some typographic mistakes were found. The contents of whole manuscript is written in different styles, write in Times New Roman format only. Table 2 data is not performed by the author so it should be written in introduction not in Result and Discussion portion. Some references were older than 10 years so cite recent references not older than 10 years.	Noted

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	