

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_97088
Title of the Manuscript:	LEAF EPIDERMAL MICROSCOPY, CHEMO-MICROSCOPY AND GC-MS ANALYSES OF THREE OCIMUM SPECIES FROM NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Review 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://www.journalapj.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>References</u></p>	<p>Yes Yes Yes The manuscript is mentioned as review article, however given the experiments done and results analysed, this cannot be considered a review paper, but an original research paper Yes Several references missing. I have highlighted the areas and marked them as reference Discussion needs to be completely re-written over. It is written as an extension of Introduction. No discussion has been done comparing the results reported in this manuscript with previously found studies, just some lines from other studies have been referenced and mentioned. Line 259 - A mere mention of one line of the results found and going on to elaborate the results of other studies cannot be considered as a discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Very old references, current ones should be provided. Several references missing. I have highlighted the areas and marked them as reference References not written in any particular format Line: 283, Almeida et al., 2007 not put as reference anywhere in the manuscript Et al missing in several references Useful Tropical Plants, 2018; PROSEA, 2018; PROTA, 2018; USDA-ARS, 2018 – not listed in references Line 238 - Melissa, 2022 – not listed in reference Tamal et al., 2015 – not listed in reference 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jhinuk Basu Mullick
Department, University & Country	University of Florida, USA