Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Medicinal Plants**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJMP_111154**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ASSESSMENT OF THE GENETIC DIVERSITY OF THE TRADITIONAL TREE SPECIES Kigelia africana (sausage tree) USING MOLECULAR MARKERS FOR CONSERVATION GENOMICS IN KENYA**
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.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1.** This manuscript highlights the critical endangerment of a specific tree species. Through research and comprehensive findings, the document shows that action is necessary for conservation of this tree and its benefits. The manuscript shows that lack of focus and actions on this problem can have a great effect on preserving biodiversity. **2.** The title is suitable. **3.** Yes, it contains aim, results, and conclusion. **4.** Yes. **5.** Yes. **6.** Yes, the majority of the references were fairly recent.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. Yes, I believe so.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Annika Fugl**
Department, University & Country	**Aalborg University, Denmark**