

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_125300
Title of the Manuscript:	HEMATOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF CHROMOLAENA ODORATA ON PHENYL HYDRAZINE INDUCED ANEMIC RATS.
Type of the Article	Research 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	New research work based on traditional use of herbal plants. Manuscript is not in proper format. Introduction is not focused on title. Several sentences although appear in different format but giving same meaning i.e. importance of plant medicines. Its must be compact and precise.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No HEMATOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF CHROMOLAENA ODORATA LEAVES EXTRACT ON PHENYL HYDRAZINE INDUCED ANAEMIC RATS	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	NO	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In section 2.1 plant samples should be collected not leaves as further author authenticated plants not leaves 2. In 2.2- 245 grams of powdered leaves should be used instead of 245 grams of <i>Chromolaena odorata</i> 3. Phytochemical analysis should be written in previous section and haematological analysis afterwards 4. No references were given in entire article. 5. Suitability of rat model is not verified by ANOVA or other statistical studies 6. Ethical committee approval for rat experiment missing 7. Rat should be purchased from some authentic agency not market 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need more	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, Revision suggested	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	NA	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gireesh Tripathi
Department, University & Country	Shri Krishna University, India