

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_125354
Title of the Manuscript:	PHARMACOGNOSTIC STUDIES OF THE LEAVES OF <i>Pseuderanthemum carruthersii</i> (Seem.) Guillaumin var. <i>carruthersii</i> (ACANTHACEAE)
Type of the 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>

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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 study is important with scientific contribution. However, the study gap needs to be clearly stated in the introduction. The writing needs to start from what is known to what is yet to be known. State if either this study contributes to eliminating the whole gap or just a part	.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title needs to be reviewed since the study has done physical and phytochemical assessment of the plant leaves. <b>Suggested title: Microscopic and phytochemical evaluation of the leaves of <i>Pseuderanthemum carruthersii</i></b>	
<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>	It needs to be revised. The background needs to state what is generally done and the objective of the study in a flow to create its significance	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Omitting of some unnecessary information as indicated in the manuscript would make some subsections to be deleted Recheck the revised manuscript for specific sections	
<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>	The methodology is ok towards scientific data acquisition with the modern technology (GCMS). The machine specifications are necessarily important Extraction method needs to be stated clearly (with CH <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub> ) and grades of the solvents used. Include each machine's specifications	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The are fairly enough but would need to recheck some. Eg. References: 5, 11, 12, Try to avoid to old reference others have more than 20- 30 years since their publication. Important to check and use most references which are within 5 years of publication and your study	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is ok only some precautions like word-word or number to symbol spaces need to be observed	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The introduction section has to be exhaustive with a clear objective of the study to attract the reader's attention. Rewrite the introduction with omitting unnecessary information. Classification information is not so necessary unless the plant is getting identified for the first time in history Key comments have been included in the manuscript file. Correct writing rules should be adhered like spacing and use of a uniform font and font size	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Frank Rwegoshora</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania</b>