

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_95405
Title of the Manuscript:	An Ethnobotanical study to document the indigenous knowledge of Buksa tribe of Uttarakhand, India
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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. The manuscript consider the knowledge of an Indian tribe about botanic species used by aged people from the tribe in the treatment of diverse diseases. The knowledge is not being transmitted to younger members of this population because these young members do not consider relevant to keep it. This article can be considered as an effort to preserve the knowledge, which is related to the biodiversity of the region, with unique characteristics. I consider is important this subject for the scientific community. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract is comprehensive, showing the scope of the work. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate. 5. I consider the manuscript is correct, however, could be improved if were included a description about the methodology used to get the data.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I consider English quality must be much improved.	
Optional/General comments	I consider is an interesting article, and can be improved if the comments are taken into account.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iris Miraballes-Martinez
Department, University & Country	Universidad De La Republica, Uruguay