

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_95594
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the activity of aqueous extracts of selected medicinal plants against freshwater target and non target organisms
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.journalaprij.com/index.php/APRJ/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4.</p> <p>5. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>7. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes Yes, but would be better as "Molluscicidal activity of selected medicinal plants aqueous stem and leave extracts on fresh water snails and fish" Incomplete It is missing the objective, methodology, conclusion. References needs to be removed. They are require updating. Few articles are current, 2018,2019, 2021 (Numbers 2,4,5 and 8) while others are old and should be updated to the current articles (span of 10 years) Yes, appropriate Yes, data is well presented and well explained as a justification of the molluscicidal activity The references are not complete with missing intext citation of reference 1-12, References missing in introduction and methodology Few typographical errors of spacing and grammer noted, can be removed by proof reading of the work. Abbreviations sch as D.D.U should be written in full (In methodology on "Toxicity experiment") Results are okay Discussion is Okay</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes,</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The methodology does not present the "Data management and analysis" framework explaining how the data was to be analysed. This must be included in the revision of the work to justify on the analysis presented in the tables 1-7</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kelvin K Juma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alupe University, Kenya</b>