

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Revision Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the Manuscript is important for scientific community. 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. 3. Yes, the Abstract is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct and up to the mark. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent also. <p>➤ Some type mistakes were observed, it has to be rectified. The corrections were mentioned in red ink mark.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Minor comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quality of English used in article is suitable for communication scholars. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Over all the article is good with contents and recommended for publication.	

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> <p>No ethical issues found.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aariff Khan
Department, University & Country	University Institute of Agriculture and Horticulture, Guru Nanak University, India