

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_97893
Title of the Manuscript:	In vivo antivenom effect of Mucuna pruriens and Millettia pinnata (Fabaceae) minerals on biochemical parameters of Oryctolagus cuniculus
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://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Yes, it can be useful for scientific community, if the work is carried out properly	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Ok, can do some modification	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Almost ok, but subsections not marked for references, in subsection 2.1.2 heading to be corrected.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Scientific content is there, but losing and grouping of animals is inappropriate	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Reference numbering style in the text is not proper, recent references are not included in the manuscript, additional references can be included.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Statistics not done /or included in the manuscript, it is not acceptable to consider manuscript without statistics	
Minor REVISION comments	Need to be improved to meet scholarly communication	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sangeetha Vijayan P
Department, University & Country	SCTIMST, India