

## 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 <i>Kigelia africana</i> (sausage tree) USING MOLECULAR MARKERS FOR CONSERVATION GENOMICS IN KENYA
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.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community  2. No, the title of the article can be modified as follows: "Genetic diversity and allelic differentiation in different populations of Kigelia africana (Lam.) Benth. in Kenya: implications for conservation".  3. the abstract is comprehensive. however, the comments should be taken into account  4. Subsections were appropriate  5. yes, the idea is original and topical.  6. Yes, all references are sufficient & recent	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. Abstract: check for spelling mistakes, clearly state the general objective of the study. 2. Introduction: references should be listed in order, check for spelling errors, summarize certain sections. 3. separate discussion parts in the results section. be precise and concise; 4. enhance the discussion by demonstrating relationships between and within populations of the species. show the implications of the study.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamadé Tidjani Guinde
Department, University & Country	University Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso