

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_106050
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacological Activities of the <i>Andrographis paniculata</i> aka Nelabevu/Bhunimba
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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/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? (Yes)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? (No)</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? (Perhaps)</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Not completely)</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- Abstract: Scientific name of plants should be in italic style</p> <p>2- Introduction:</p> <p>a) -The authors need to show the novelty of the work by including the latest work related to the plant used, by setting a table for this matter.</p> <p>b)- The authors need to show the novelty of the work by listing the chemical components of the plant used, and this is done by developing a special table for this matter.</p> <p>c)- Authors need to show the novelty of the work by including a picture of the plant used</p> <p>d)- The authors need to show the novelty of the work by listing the most important challenges regarding the plant used.</p> <p>3- The conclusion is very poor in contents, and must be re-write in best formula</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	(Its need to more improved)	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aymn Yaseen Sharaf Zebaree
Department, University & Country	College of Pharmacy, Ninevah University, Iraq