

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_96856
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethno-Botanical Survey of Plants Used for the Treatment of Sexually Transmitted Diseases in the Sudan savannah region of Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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	Yes	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Fair Yes Good	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The concept of the work was good and effort had been made by the author to collect the data. The results were tabulated.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The discussion part lacks little and can be enhanced more with recent literature support.	
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)	The work is simply a data collection. The scientific concept could have been added. The author can concentrate more on survey cum scientific work and that will be more useful.	
Minor REVISION comments	Good	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. N. Meena Devi
Department, University & Country	Noorul Islam Centre for Higher Education, India