

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_104316
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of in vitro Anti-inflammatory and Antibacterial properties of tuberous roots of <i>Mirabilis jalapa</i> Found in Sri Lanka
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://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)
<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. It is very interesting article - medicinal plants are globally valuable sources of new drugs. With the increasing demand for herbal drugs, natural health products, and secondary metabolites of medicinal plants, the use of medicinal plants is growing rapidly throughout the world. The article raises a very important topic for all humanity: the investigations of new herbal medicine source from the Earth Flora.</p> <p>2. In my opinion, the title of the manuscript is absolutely appropriate for the submitted text and I have no alternative</p> <p>3. Yes, the article abstract is absolutely comprehensive</p> <p>4. The article structure is right for the article in my mind</p> <p>5. As the scientific side, article is absolutely correct and understanding</p> <p>6. The references are well</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The results here presented merit and good commenters. I agree with the strong claims that the author has made.</p> <p>The structure of the article is clear and well organized. The title, abstract, introduction, headings, subheadings, opening sentences, and conclusion of the article are well.</p> <p>Abstract gives an overview of the study's purpose, links with Materials and Methods.</p> <p>The authors identify gaps in the existing literature and tell us how the current study will fill that problem in the Introduction section of the article.</p> <p>In my opinion, the manuscript is suitable for publication. Overall, this is a good paper.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olena Grechana
Department, University & Country	Zaporizhzhya State Medical University, Ukraine