



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_49039
Title of the Manuscript:	The potential of benefiting variation between the same species of Artemisia herba-alba from different Location in Northeast of Libya
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This paper is loose. Just look at my comments in the main article.	
Minor REVISION comments	Not really but I expected more from the authors in terms of going further to run quantitative phytochemicals or GC-MS phytochemical to know at what extent does this agree with the qualitative phytochemicals.	Thank you We have not equipment for GC-MS in our university
Optional/General comments	I recommend that this article be published as a short communication after revision.	I agree with you we will publish it as a short article

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)	