

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	

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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript covers important analytical technique which could be helpful for students and researchers. Being novel research in quantification of Ursolic acid in <i>Bauhinia racemosa</i> Lam, I believe that it will be impactful in the area of phytochemistry. In this regard, I wish to urge the author to review the article so that it may be more helpful to readers and hence contribute to the pool of knowledge in this area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable. However, the author should review it and avoid including acronyms but instead include full method name.	Full name has been included
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.	Abstract is adequate	
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.	The name of the plant in the study needs to be formatted in italics. There is inadequate citation of independent assertions in some sections. The author also needs to acknowledge the source of figure 1 as included in text. The study site or location as well as the manufactures of major equipment used in the study like the Soxhlet apparatus and HPTLC system have not been disclosed. Additionally, the exact alcohol used in the hydroalcoholic solvent during Soxhlet extraction has not been stated. The results and discussion section is inadequate. The author has repeated text fit for the introduction/ background section in extensive sections of the results and discussion section. The author should also include figures 1a (which is erroneous since there is another figure 1 on the introduction section) 1b, 2, 3 and 4 which illustrate the results of this study must be included in the results and discussion section and executed adequately. The author did not discuss the performance of the novel HPTLC method for the quantification of the analyte against other methods from previous research literature or the study own's UV Vis Spectrophotometer qualitative estimation of Ursolic acid in <i>Bauhinia racemosa</i> Lam.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Plant name in Italics done● Source of figure 1 added● Volume of hydroalcohol added● Manufactures name added● Peformance of HPTLC over Uv vis justified● Figure number changed
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are as old as 1988. They need to be reviewed for accuracy compared to recent information.	References reviewed for accuracy

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication. However, the author needs to address a few programmatical errors throughout the article.	Changes done
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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>	