

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_95160
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological and taxonomic diversity of taxa considered as infrataxons of Phaseolus lunatus in Benin
Type of the 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://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/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>1. This manuscript has important value for the scientific community because it has provided new information that seed characters have important taxonomic value which may then be used to identify taxa within <i>Phaseolus lunatus</i>.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable with the aims of the research and has described the contents of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract has described the aims, methods, and results of the research which has made it easy for the reader to understand the conclusions of the research. However, the method section does not explain in detail the entire workflow of the research.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript have followed the guidelines of the journal</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, although there are some corrections such as in the key identification of species that does not follow the general format. I recommend using 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, instead of using the sign of (-)</p> <p>6. As much as 68% of the references used are published in the last 10 years, but there are some notes: a. References must be sorted alphabetically b. What do the numbers 16,17,18, 19 mean in reference no. 18 - 21 ?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Isna Arofatun Nikmah
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pertahanan Republik Indonesia, Indonesia