

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_98347
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SCENT LEAF (<i>Ocimum gratissimum</i>) AQUEOUS EXTRACT ON NEUROMUSCULAR FUNCTIONS OF ALBINO RATS (<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>)
Type of the Article	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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	Yes, it has the scientific importance to the community, but the way the study was executed is not aligned. There is no positive control included in the study and the Rats weighing 40 to 90g used in the study raise a concern. Justify the rational of going with young animals? They should specify the age of the animals. Rational behind selecting only aqueous extracts for the study. The title should be OK. Needs improvement. Need to be organised more appropriately. Yes, it adds some scientific inputs but needs to be organised. Literature survey on the other activities of the plant would add more weightage to the MS.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Average.	
Optional/General comments	The authors should focus more on the language, there are lot of grammatical errors, that needs to be addressed. The formatting is not appropriate.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Devaraj Venkatapura Chandrashekar
Department, University & Country	Chapman University, U.S. A