

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_97666
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF PHARMACOLOGICAL ACTIONS OF BRASSAIOPSIS HAINLA LEAVES IN THE CONSTRAINT OF HELMINTHS, THROMBOLYTIC, CYTOTOXIC, DIARRHEA, PYREXIA: IN VIVO, IN VITRO APPROACHES.
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://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/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 REVISION</b> 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. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>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></p>	<p>A good Research Article after taking notes</p> <p>Good but lengthy can be shortened</p> <p>Quite good</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Yes, with notes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	good	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Notes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reason methanol is used in the extraction process is that it is a toxic substance.</li> <li>2. The work methods were not supported by scientific sources, especially the extraction process and sample preparation.</li> <li>3. 14 days of soaking is too long</li> <li>4. The drying method is not clean</li> <li>5. Crude extract what does it mean to him</li> <li>6. How do you calculate the fractions of minutes in death?</li> <li>7. How was the effect of methanol excluded in the experiments?</li> <li>8. The extract concentrations used in the experiment were not standardized</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hussein L. Algboory</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Qasim Green University, Iraq</b>