

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_86487
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE MORPHOLOGY AND MICROMORPHOLOGY OF <i>Hypoestes rosea</i> Linn. AND <i>Asystasia gangetica</i> Sol.ex.R.Br. (ACANTHACEAE)
Type of the Article	

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

(<https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Reference numbering in the manuscript should follow ascending order; yours has scattered numbering (starting with [9] instead of [1]. The first author you referenced in your manuscript should have the number [1] mark. Make this correction, please</li> <li>2. Number is not animate, you therefore cannot say ".....<i>Hypoestes rosea</i> were stated by [6]" rather you should say ".....<i>Hypoestes rosea</i> were stated by Gill [6]. Just like you should not say something like this "[6] implied that taxonomic characterization is ....." rather you should say "Gill [6] implied that taxonomic characterization is ....." . Effect the corrections please</li> <li>3. The manuscript is not well punctuated; please, insert punctuation marks where necessary so as to convey the information appropriately</li> <li>4. Units are written after a space ie; 20 % or 20 cm not 20% or 20cm. Make the necessary adjustments, please</li> <li>5. Grammatical inconsistencies and inappropriate verbs are observed in the manuscript; they have been highlighted in red. Check and make the corrections</li> <li>6. It is PHOTOMICROGRAPHY not photomicroscopy</li> <li>7. Figure 1 B, C, D were stained with methylene blue, why did you not state it in your materials and methods? You only stated that the samples were stained with safranin; safranin has red colour not blue. What stain did you use in your Figures 1 B, C and D to produce blue?</li> <li>8. Your "Figures 1(A-D)" is wrongly labelled; those are PLATES not FIGURES. Make the corrections. The same for Figure 2 to 4; they are PLATES. Please, correct!</li> <li>9. Your sections are not too good; if you have better micrographs please, use them to replace these ones in the manuscript</li> <li>10. "Stoma" is singular while "stomata" is plural. " It is either ".....no stoma was seen" or ".....no stomata were seen" NOT ".....no stomata was seen". Correct this on the manuscript</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Thanks for sharing your findings with the public. Trichome has always been a good diagnostic tool used for delimitation of species. Your work has truly added to the body of taxonomic knowledge!	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Obiageri Florence Ajah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>King David University of Medical Sciences, Nigeria</b>