

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_86296
Title of the Manuscript:	Elicitation of tuberosc concrete, deliberation of recovery and qualitative examination from <i>Agave amica</i> L. cv Arka Prajwal
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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	<p>The article is not interesting or innovative to science, it is very poorly written, with many misspellings, it needs to include several methodologies and complete those described in the text.</p> <p>The bibliographic references that appear at the end of the document are not referenced in the text, the results are not well described, nor is there a discussion of these, they don't compare the results obtained with other similar works.</p> <p>I consider that this work should not be accepted for publication, it is not of quality. The journal should make a better selection of papers for review, since it is a waste of time to review incomplete, poorly written papers without scientific importance to contribute.</p> <p>The conclusion does not agree with the results shown, firstly because nowhere in the methodology is it described that they were collected flowers during the morning, afternoon or evening hours, and the authors conclude that "in the morning has a greater influence on concrete recovery in tuberosc". Second, it is never described in materials and methods that an identification of compounds has been carried out in the obtained extracts, while in the conclusion the authors say that "the identified compounds have applications in the promotion of plant growth" how do they know this if they don't analyse any compounds?</p> <p>Third observation, that they mean that "The single types are more suitable than the double type since the double type has a lower oil content compared to the single type (Hussain, 1992; Hussain, 1986)." never put bibliographical references in a conclusion.</p> <p>Fourth observation, the authors say that "The identified compounds act as inhibitors, solvents, defense compounds, phytochemicals and their biological importance can help in pharmacological applications." How do they know? if your study did not perform any in vitro or in vivo tests to prove it.</p>	Noted and corrected
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)	