

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_88719
Title of the Manuscript:	Wood anatomical study of <i>Osyris quadripartita</i> Salz. ex Decne (African sandalwood) from the Northern Western Ghats, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The manuscript contains numerous sentence construction and grammatical errors. It is strongly advisable to perform spellcheck, grammatical check, and sentence construction verification for any construction errors. The abstract is corrected, it is advised that similar corrections should be done for other segments also,</li><li>2. Please get the entire manuscript by a native English speaker or by any standard grammar software.</li><li>3. The paper lacks the standard get-up of a research paper. Introduction, material methods, results, and discussions need to be written in distinct heads. It is unnecessary to write results in the introduction part.</li><li>4. The purpose of the study is not mentioned.</li><li>5. How the investigated species differs from <i>Santalum</i> is not mentioned.</li><li>6. If the investigated species is used as an adulterant, the differences between the species with <i>Santalum</i> should be mentioned.</li><li>7. List of chemicals used in the study should be given in the materials section.</li><li>8. Method section should be more elaborate and more scientific. It is suggested to go through a few similar papers, study the pattern in which methods are written and then write the methods.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Please check the manuscript for further corrections.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper is not in a position to be accepted. It needs serious major revision both from the scientific and structural angles.	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dwaipayan Sinha
Department, University & Country	Government General Degree College, India