

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_101585
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROMORPHOLOGICAL AND PHARMACOGNOSTIC STUDIES OF THE FLOWER OF <i>Mussaenda philippica</i> L. (RUBIACEAE)
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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the article is important for pharmacognosy science.</p> <p>2. Yes, but the title contains double preposition. Title suggestions "Micromorphological And Pharmacognostic Studies of <i>Mussaenda philippica</i> L. Flower"</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. No, it need to be adjusted to the rules of the journal and numbered</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references sufficient but not recent. The references of articles should be updated can be started in 2010 until now.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of this article is not good enough, it needs to be improved (examples : too many double to be, double preposition and so on)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All my comments had written in the right of the text. Please Click simbols of comments to know my review. The manuscript needs a professional native English proofreading service.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Warsi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia