

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_108472
Title of the Manuscript:	Dioscorea dumetorum (Kunth) T. Durand & H. Schinz.: A new addition to the flora of Jharkhand, India
Type of the Article	Short communication

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</p> <p>Yes, however, it is better to write a new record instead of new addition in the title.</p> <p>The abstract must be completed.</p> <p>Not appropriate</p> <p>I have a suspicion in this matter. Because the type specimen is not compared with the new record in the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It needs more corrections in terms of spelling, grammar, etc.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript must be changed according to the journal instructions and the English must be rechecked for spelling, grammar, etc.</p> <p>The manuscript has many ambiguities in terms of the identification of the new record. Because it is not compared with the type specimen of the species. In the manuscript, the origin of the type specimen is also indistinct. Moreover, we do not use the word "Type" for the new record of the species. The species that is introduced first by the author must have a taxonomic description and be identified as the type specimen. Additionally, in this manuscript diagnostic characters of the species are not mentioned. It is better to add micromorphological characters to confirm this species in that region. Also, in other parts of India, this species had been reported previously. It is better to compare the new addition to the previous record of the species that was reported from another region of India too. In my opinion, this manuscript must be checked again properly.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Golaleh Mostafavi
Department, University & Country	Yadegar-e-Imam Khomeini Shahre Rey Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran