

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_101554
Title of the Manuscript:	Microwave-assisted Extraction and Characterization of Essential Oil from Melaleuca cajuputi Collected in Southern Vietnam
Type of the 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://journalajb2t.com/index.php/AJB2T/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, Very Good, the comparison with traditional hydro-distillation highlights the advantages of MAE in terms of both quality and quantity of essential oil extraction. The findings regarding optimal extraction parameters, physicochemical properties of the extracted oils, and the potential medicinal applications of the compounds contribute to the knowledge in the field of essential oil extraction and characterization.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. However, if you are looking for an alternative title, you may consider: "Comparative Study of Microwave-assisted Extraction and Hydro-distillation Methods for Extracting Essential Oil from Melaleuca cajuputi in Southern Vietnam: Yield, Composition, and Efficiency Analysis"</p> <p>3. The abstract covers the aims of the study, the methodology employed (microwave-assisted extraction and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry analysis), the results obtained (major components identified in the extracted essential oil and the highest yield achieved), and the conclusion drawn (comparison of extraction methods and effectiveness of microwave-assisted extraction).</p> <p>4 & 5 . Very Good The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its approach, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, a thorough assessment of the scientific accuracy can only be made by reviewing the complete manuscript, including any additional details, analyses, and discussions provided</p> <p>6 Corrected</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In scholarly communications, it is essential for the language and English quality of an article to meet the standards of academic writing. The language should be clear, concise, and precise, with appropriate technical terminology and scientific language. The article should demonstrate a logical flow of ideas and concepts, with well-structured sentences and paragraphs. Grammar, spelling, and punctuation should be accurate, and the writing should adhere to the conventions of scholarly writing, including proper citation and referencing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Theerarat Suwanaruang
Department, University & Country	Kalasin University, Thailand