

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_78182
Title of the Manuscript:	Parasitic contamination of fresh bitter leaf vegetables - Onugbu ( <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> ): a case study of farms in Nimo, Njikoka Local Government Area, Anambra State, Nigeria
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://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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. This research needs to explain the novelty of the research. In addition, in the introduction,</li> <li>2. it is necessary to explain the urgency of the research and the phenomenon of the current use of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> and the conditions of its use in Nigeria. There needs to be an explanation of the gap between the phenomenon and its usefulness so that the research results can provide new information for readers.</li> <li>3. There needs to be alignment of goals written in the abstract and in the introduction.</li> <li>4. Need a more detailed explanation of the sedimentation method used.</li> <li>5. Each table should be given a detailed explanation (the meaning of each value in the table).</li> <li>6. The discussion is more focused on research results. The discussion needs to review several things that affect the results of such research.</li> <li>7. Some of the references used are old references (2011, 2009, 2007), it is better to improve with new publications.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Need a more detailed explanation for each section of the article. It is necessary to describe the value of each table	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This article is acceptable if there is an update described in the introduction	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hana Catur Wahyuni
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia