

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_95954
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity of trichomes in <i>Calliandra haematocephala</i> Hassk. (Caesalpinioideae DC., Fabaceae Lindl.)
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.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)
<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>The manuscript could be important for the scientific community after minor corrections are done to improve on the quality of work. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for details on corrections needed.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The abstract is incomplete and lacks other relevant aspects. It needs to be recast.</p> <p>The structure or content of certain aspects of the manuscript needs to be recast. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for details on corrections needed.</p> <p>This aspect can be improved. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for details on corrections needed.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and some are fairly recent. However, the authors might improve them and strictly follow the journal style of referencing. Please refer to the annotated manuscript for details on corrections needed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This aspect needs to be improved for suitability for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs minor correction before consideration for acceptance.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prince Emmanuel Norman
Department, University & Country	Sierra Leone Agricultural Research Institute, Sierra Leone