**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:


**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Compulsory REVISION comments | I recommend reviewing the entire manuscript:  
- include the references in table 1  
- include chemical and reagent specifications in tests  
- number the tests and describe them in the sequence that were cited in the text  
- The conclusion is confusing, as it suggests that the manuscript is researched into the therapeutic performance of the components. Please make it clear that the manuscript characterized the components of the extracts of the researched plants. |

**PART 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</td>
<td>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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