

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_96714
Title of the Manuscript:	Jasmine (Jasminum sambac (L.) Aiton): Potential Utilization and Bioactivity
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Title of research should be appropriate.</b> Introduction should be more precise. Objective of the study should be clearly mentioned. Scientific studies should be discussed in more detail.  and Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated? As the discussion of the study were promising in relation to bioactive compounds study, in my opinion, the study should continue with the anti-inflammatory activity of medicinal plants in detail.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s)	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors have failed to convey their work in a way which can be understood properly by any competent reader.	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madieha Ambreen
Department, University & Country	Minhaj University, Pakistan