

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_98415
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF LIPID AND FATTY ACIDS COMPOSITION OVER THE GROUND PART OF NEPETA OLGAE REGEL (L.) PLANTS GROWING IN NAMANGAN REGION
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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. Yes, it important 2. No, it's better to avoid the word 'study', instead it needs to be replaced by estimation, or other related word. Requires revision 3. No, it lacks structure; eg, method part, objective, are not clearly described 4. It requires revision structure, and data presentation (at least some variables need to be presented using graph or other) 5. Yes, but needs revision 6. Yes, references are sufficient Additional points: 7. In the result section , some paragraphs need to be merged , as there are few sentences 8. The result section, and discussion need to described separately as subheading,	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. It needs modification on font size, syntax errors, 2. Tables(avoid the borders), add one or two graphs	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is relevant to scientific community, after accommodating the major and minor revisions	

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:	Leake Gebremeskel Gebrehiwot
Department, University & Country	Aksum University, Ethiopia