

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_84231
Title of the Manuscript:	Indigenous Herbs and Spices in Selected Areas of North Cotabato: An Ethnobotanical Survey
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://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		1. Total number of pages has already been reduced from 30 pages to 25.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		1. I guess only herbs that has been mentioned were already justified. Out of 48 species, only 27 were mentioned and were given and had been elaborated. 2. Number of references is already reduced. Only those references were mentioned in the literatures are placed in the but a few citations from the authors were mentioned for modification on proponent's additional knowledge on the discussions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The author has done a detailed survey analysis on medicinal plants on a selected region and has done the qualitative analysis.</p> <p>The survey was done some 9 years back. That is the major query in the article. All the work and the reference were date backed (10 years old article) Also the flow of write up seems to be clumsy. Otherwise everything finds good</p>	<p>1. I appreciated the comments of the detailed survey analysis on the study since this study really takes time and more effort to do such field study in order to come up with the results.</p> <p>2. This is actually a Masters' Thesis research in which the proponents just come up now on to publication. The subject of the research is still clinically relevant and valid so I think this is still acceptable only that references should be updated.</p> <p>3. I can't get over the comments of the flow of write up seems clumsy. Because the way I understand it, I am not that skillful in doing such research. Why will I take efforts on this if I am not doing this diligently and manageable? Sorry if I have to express out like this. But in the long run, I thank all the comments being raised.</p>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Thanks for the additional info on Ethical Consideration. The study adhered to RA 10173 or the Data Privacy Act of 2012. 1. Informed consent was sought and obtained before the study. 2. Anonymity was ensured by not collecting identifying information of individual subjects. 3. Confidentiality was ensured by not divulging the identity of the respondent's organizations. 4. The author enters into a relationship with participants treated with respect, cared and empathy. 5. The author spent sufficient time with the participants and engaged them in dialogue to obtained extensive results of the study. 6. The author provided communication and feedback mechanisms and 2-way communication throughout the study and beyond.