

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Plant Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_120902
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review about Barleria prionitis L.: A rarely known herb with potential Medicinal Properties
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

## Review Form 3

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The chosen field is important from a scientific point of view. The quality and the scientific soundness is fairly good.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article is appropriate.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract of the article is clear and well established with clear and concise language.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Sections and subsections in the text are not numbered correctly.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	From a scientific point of view the manuscript is correct. The subject is good, the approach is pragmatic and precise and the results are clear, well systematized and bring useful information to.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	References are sufficient and recent. Citations in the text do not comply with the requirements of the journal's editorial guidelines.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The entire article should be proofread for minor grammatical errors, punctuation, etc.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend publishing it after reviewing the manuscript.	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Zagrai Gavrilă</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Cluj-Napoca, Saint Sylvester Secondary School, Romania</b>