

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_99494</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Utilising inter-Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA, assess genetic variability in indigenous medicinal plant Heart-leaved Moonseed (<i>Tinospora cordifolia</i>)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research work</b>

### 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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</b> REVISION 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>Yes. The manuscript has a little contribution in scientific research.</b>  <b>Yes, but should improve.</b>  <b>No. Some findings of the study should be presented here.</b>  <b>No. Some materials and methods portion are presented in results and discussion part.</b>  <b>No. Results written by the authors do not match with the findings, graphs and tables. Therefore, it needs revision.</b>  <b>No. Latest reference work is more than one decade ago. Needs to be improve.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Needs to be improve.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Manuscript is poorly written. Stated results do not match with the tables and figures. Manuscript and reference style is not maintained.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mamunur Rahman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bangladesh Rice Research Institute, Bangladesh</b>