

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_127504
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Ursolic acid in Bauhinia racemosa Lam. by HPTLC method
Type of the Article	Research

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 <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in current research and offers novel insights that could drive future studies in the field. The topic is highly relevant, and the findings contribute to advancing understanding in an area that has implications for both theoretical knowledge and practical applications.	Thank you for your valuable comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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 of the article is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and implications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
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.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive methodology, clear hypothesis, and well-supported data. The authors have employed appropriate experimental techniques and statistical analyses, ensuring the reliability of their results. Additionally, the literature review is thorough, demonstrating a solid understanding of the current state of research in the field and effectively contextualizing the study's contributions. The findings are presented with clarity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript appear to be generally sufficient, covering key studies in the field and providing a solid foundation for the research.	
Minor REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	