

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_94962
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF ENDEMIC FLORA DIVERSITY OF NORTH SULAWESI AS A POTENTIAL FOR SUSTAINABLE ECOTOURISM
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Revision Comments</b></p> <p>1. Yes, the Manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The details of native flora and fauna existence and its importance in BNTP was described scientifically. The diversity of flora and fauna with its diverse and endemic ecosystems is a special attraction of tourist destinations.</p> <p>3. Yes, the Abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct and up to the mark.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent also.</p> <p>➤ Some type mistakes were observed, it has to be rectified. The corrections were mentioned in red ink mark.</p>	<p>➤ It has been fixed and I colored it blue.</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Minor comments</b></p> <p>1. The quality of English used in article is suitable for communication scholars.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Over all the article is good with contents and recommended for publication.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	