

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_99834
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Aqueous Extract of Moringa Oleifera leaves using GC-MS Analysis.
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://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. The manuscript is of scientific interest, it consisted in highlighting the active molecules contained in the Moringa oleifera plant 2. The title is well defined, understandable and announces the objective of the work. 3. The summary is well written. suggestion: increase the word count to 200 words. 4. Manuscript is well structured but there is an error in the numbering of the titles (2. Materials and Methods) 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. ok for the references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	correct	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dembele Georges Stephane
Department, University & Country	University Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire