

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_98272
Title of the Manuscript:	Floristic Composition and Species Diversity of Wintering Herbs in Blue pine Forest of Thimphu District, Bhutan
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.journalaprij.com/index.php/APRJ/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 REVISION</b> 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>	<b>Yes. The information generated from the study can contribute to the body of knowledge, particularly that plants are very sensitive such that they are used as key indicators of ecosystem disturbance and also for climate change.</b> <b>Yes, the title captures the problem and the expected results of the study.</b> <b>Yes.</b> <b>Yes.</b> <b>Yes. Perhaps a little discussion to deepen the explanation about the factors influencing the floristic composition in the various sampling sites may give the readers a more profound understanding of the conditions.</b> <b>The references are quite sufficient. However, more recent literature may improve the reliability of the information.</b> <b>The article is not one that talks about issues or phenomena that we can consider new. There have been a lot of similar studies conducted about floristic composition and diversity in many parts of the globe. Hence, more recent literature can make the outputs of the study more meaningful, especially in relation to climate change.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes. The technical writing quality is good and fit for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Recommended for publication, after adding more recent literature.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rowena P. Varela
Department, University & Country	Caraga State University, Philippines