

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_96922
Title of the Manuscript:	TAXONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF FOLIAR AND STEM ANATOMY OF PIPTADENIASTRUM AFRICANUM (HOOK.F.) BRENNAN AND CATHORMION ALTISSIMUM (HOOK.F.) HUTCH. & DANDY
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://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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.The manuscript important for scientific community</p> <p>2.Title of the article suitable, good and clear.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article comprehensive, good and clear. The sentence structure in the abstract needs to be rearranged: Aims, study design, place and duration of study, methodology, results, and conclusion</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate. Materials and methods with subtitle : area study, experimental design, data collection methods/measurement of research results, data analysis</p> <p>5.The manuscript is good, supported by new research methods and complete data presented.</p> <p>6. The references sufficient and some references are very old. Need to add the recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Writing the manuscript is adjusted to the guidelines for the author. Consistency of citation method</p> <p>Figure: how many times magnification.....nits (µm or mm): needs to be increased in resolution</p> <p>In the discussion it is necessary to compare with the results of research from other researchers</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:	Dwi Susanto
Department, University & Country	Mulawarman University, Indonesia