

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130345
Title of the Manuscript:	Method of Natural Product Isolation: A Review
Type of the Article	Review article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of methods for isolating natural products, highlighting their relevance in drug development and medicinal applications. By evaluating both traditional and modern extraction techniques, the study bridges knowledge gaps and offers insights into more efficient and environmentally friendly methods. Given the increasing reliance on natural products for healthcare globally, this work serves as a valuable resource for researchers aiming to optimize extraction processes for bioactive compounds. Furthermore, the findings can inspire innovations in drug synthesis, herbal medicine, and sustainable practices in natural product research.	Noted with thanks
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I want to suggest some titles. 1."Advances in Natural Product Isolation: A Comprehensive Review of Techniques and Applications". 2."Optimizing Natural Product Isolation for Drug Development: A Technical Review". 3."Innovative Techniques for Natural Product Isolation: Bridging Tradition and Modernity"	Noted with thanks
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 could benefit from a few additions and deletions to enhance its impact and clarity. Additions such as emphasizing the applications of natural products in drug development and the advantages of modern techniques like MAE and SFE would make it more informative. Mentioning the sustainability aspect of these methods would also add relevance. On the other hand, removing repetitive statements about traditional and modern methods would streamline the content and avoid redundancy. These adjustments would ensure the abstract remains focused, comprehensive, and engaging.	Noted with thanks
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct based on the provided content.	Noted with 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 recent and relevant.	Noted with thanks
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but it could benefit from minor refinements to enhance clarity, grammar, and flow, particularly in sections where sentence structures are lengthy.	Noted with thanks
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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>	Noted with thanks