

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_98484
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Herbal Germicide-Aided Natural Solution for Women's Hygiene without any side and adverse effect in laboratory
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://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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, it is	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, it is not. Some results of study must be added.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, I do.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, In results and discussion, the study must be compared with other studies.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Methodology and result and discussion sections must be expanded with more references cited. Make the study and outcomes reproducible by other researchers.	
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)	The results must be shown by figures and tables. The novelties of study should be combined together as mostly are telling same fact.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is not formatted properly.	

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:	Nazila Biglari
Department, University & Country	Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia