

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_102093
Title of the Manuscript:	A note on Yamazakia pusilla (Willd.) W.R.Barker, Y.S.Liang & Wannan from Jamtara Forest Division, Jamtara, Jharkhand, India
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://www.journalapj.com/index.php/APRJ/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. It is good for scientific community, but there it a lot of weakness that need improvement. 2. The title is not suitable for me I suggest it as: A note on Yamazakia pusilla (Willd.) from Jamtara Forest Division, Jamtara, Jharkhand, India. 3. The abstract is not comprehensive, add the comment in the document deeply, the author must correct it based on the suggestions. 4. The article have many weakness, one is lack of structure and subsections, please correct it based on the comment in the main manuscript. 5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct it lacks like coherence even it dose not incorporate the conclusion ans recommendations and also the purpose of the study is not mentioned. 6. No, the reference is not sufficient and the author must search in different data base and write about it. The more comment is in the main manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It need rewrite	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the manuscript needs revisions.	

Comment [1]: What it mean, the alternative name of a single species or other species? I do not understand it.

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Binega Derebe
Department, University & Country	Injibara University, Ethiopia

