

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58470

Title: *Comparative Pharmacognostical and Phytochemical Evaluation of Seeds of Karanja (Pongamia pinnata Pierre) and Palasha (Butea monosperma Lam.)*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study compares two important medicinal plants using standard analytical methods
- Pharmacognostical, physicochemical, phytochemical, and TLC evaluations are well integrated
- The methodology is clearly described and can be reproduced
- Findings contribute to herbal drug authentication and quality control
- The discussion links traditional Ayurvedic knowledge with laboratory observations
- Tables and figures improve data presentation
- The work has practical value for future pharmacognostic research

Weakness of the study:

- Ethical clearance or exemption statement is not mentioned
- Sample size and collection details could be described more clearly
- Statistical analysis is limited or absent
- Some grammatical and formatting errors require correction
- Recent literature could be cited more extensively
- The discussion could compare findings with more previous studies
- Clinical relevance should be explained in greater detail

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents a useful comparative pharmacognostical and phytochemical evaluation of Karanja and Palasha seeds with relevance to Ayurvedic medicine and herbal drug standardization. The experimental methods are appropriate and include macroscopic, microscopic, physicochemical, phytochemical, and chromatographic analyses. The results are presented systematically and supported with clear tables and figures. The manuscript is generally well written and easy to understand, although several grammatical errors, spacing issues, and formatting inconsistencies should be corrected before publication. Since the study involves plant materials and laboratory analysis only, institutional ethical clearance may not be required; however, the authors should clearly mention this in the manuscript. The absence of statistical analysis and limited comparison with recent published studies slightly reduce the scientific strength of the work. A brief section describing study limitations would also improve the paper. Overall, this is a meaningful study that provides useful reference data and is suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original scientific study, and no obvious evidence of previous publication or duplicate content was identified during this review. However, a standard plagiarism similarity check should be performed by the journal before acceptance to verify originality and ensure compliance with ethical publication standards.