

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_92650
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON THE EFFECTS OF ETHANOLIC STEM BARK EXTRACT OF <i>Parkia biglobosa</i> (LOCUS BEAN) ON SOME PATHOGENIC FUNGI
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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:

(<https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/editorial-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 1. Line 3. "some pathogenic fungi" is not clear and is better specified.</li> <li>2. Page 1. Line 5 should read "...ailments such as cough...."</li> <li>3. Page 1. Line 6 should read "...hemorrhoids, wounds and hookworms."</li> <li>4. Page 1. Line 8 should read "...at the Department of Plant Science, Modibbo....."</li> <li>5. Page 1. Line 9-15. The sentences should be revised to cover all contributions from all organization and mentioning the university only once is enough.</li> <li>6. Page 1. Line 15-19. In all sentences, previous methods are referred to so all the sentences should be combined to make it much more compact and repeated patterns can be omitted.</li> <li>7. Page 1. Line 19. How many replicates? This is significant because it reflects reliability.</li> <li>8. Page 1. Line 23 should read "...tannins but without polysaccharides."</li> <li>9. Page 1. Line 28 should read "...extracts, the higher..."</li> <li>10. Page 1. Line 34-35. The sentence is same as above [Line 5-6] so it should be revised.</li> <li>11. Page 2. Line 1. The reference must be provided.</li> <li>12. Page 2. Line 21 should read "...Department of Plant Science, Modibbo.."</li> <li>13. Page 2. Line 24 should read "...into powder, weighed and...."</li> <li>14. Page 3. Table 1. Column 1. Item 3 should read "Terpenoids"</li> <li>15. Page 3. Line 6 should read "...[10] which shows that,....."</li> <li>16. Page 3. Line 7 should read "Terpenoids"</li> <li>17. Page 3. Line 8 should read "...researchers such as [12] who reported that..."</li> <li>18. Page 3. Line 12 should read "...shown in Table 2."</li> <li>19. Page 3. Line 12 and Table 2. This actually should be put in the form of graph which is much clearer.</li> <li>20. Page 3. Table 2. The heading should read The effects of <i>Parkia</i>...."</li> <li>21. Page 3. Line 17. "...the higher the higher.." is wrong.</li> <li>22. Page 3. Line 21 should read "...[14] who reported that..."</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pipat Chotoo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Prince of Songkla University, Thailand</b>