

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_121211
Title of the Manuscript:	Stachys byzantina: Nutritional Value, Culinary Potential, and Sustainability of an Unconventional Food Plant
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment [the style of reference writing should be consistent in all sentences either [14] [15] or (name and year) you may use reference numbers consistently and not name and year if you like in some areas and reference numbers in others] Role played by each author. [Document the role played by each co-author to qualify them as authors please] CONFLICT OF INTEREST – Please make a conflict-of interest declaration by stating you have no conflict of interest to declare]]	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.	This article is important and relevant for readers to know about the plant all over the world.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	It is alright	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Is important for readers to know about the contents of and action of the plant they consume and what to expect when they eat the plant	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes but the referencing style in the text and in the write up of the references should be consistent using one style and not different styles in the text and references	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English needs to be corrected using past tense	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	See above, you can quickly make the changes to make the article publishable please	

Review Form 3

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:	Anthony Kodzo-Grey Venyo
Department, University & Country	North Manchester General Hospital, England