

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_121973
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VIVO STUDY OF BITTER LEAF ( <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> ) PLANT ON THE REMEDIATION OF THE CYTOLOGICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL DAMAGES ON WISTER RAT (ALBINO RAT) CAUSED BY <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>
Type of the Article	Original 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**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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>
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.	This is a detailed work. The author performed an articulated study	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is a suitable article	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and was well elucidated	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes thppropriatee subscriptions and structure of the manuscript were a	
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.	The manuscript was written and succinct. Described extraction of Vernenium Amygdalina . Thry did extensive wwork on treatment of rat infested bacteria. Checked the effect on full blood count and whit blood cells	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the English language was suitable	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**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>Ngozi Udem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Nigeria</b>