

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARRB_104246 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Composition, diversity, and value of ecological importance in Andean grassland ecosystems according to the altitudinal gradient in the Huacracocha micro-watershed, Peru |
| 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes, very important, since it reports how using mathematics it can be determined the distribution of the floristic in the region of Peru.</p> <p>Yes, very suitable and the data are in agreement with the title</p> <p>Yes, very well and clearly</p> <p>Yes, very well crafted and structured the subsections of the paper</p> <p>Yes, just maybe I suggest to indicate the hypothesis, and question to be answered</p> <p>Yes. The references are OK, just only to be clear in the format of the references to homogenize them, and to put DOI to each one</p> <p>I like a lot how the authors report and perform the investigation.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, the language and the English are very well and suitable for scholarly communications</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Gloria Guillermina Guerrero M |
| Department, University & Country | University Autonomous of Zacatecas, Mexico |