

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Applied Life Sciences International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JALSI_96276 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evolutionary trend in Passiflora species reveled by RAPD-PCR, gene specific ITS and rbcl markers |
| Type of the Article | Original research |

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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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) | It is fairly important. It tries to justify the use of rbcl and ITS gene for molecular taxonomy. It is. The Abstract needs to be improved on greatly. It is lengthy – about 350 words. It seems not to summarize the work. Yes, they are. I believe so. The references are too old; the most recent is in 2015 – which 8 years ago. The use of English needs to be really improved on; perhaps the authors are not native speakers of English Language. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | It is just fair. It needs to be really improved on. Too many errors which can turn off native speakers of the English. | |
| Optional/General comments | The flow/logical presentation of the points in the manuscript needs to be improved on. | |

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: | Okoh Olayinka Sunday |
| Department, University & Country | Anchor University, Nigeria |