

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_99303
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycorrhizal Morphology and Symbiotic Fungi on the Root of Pyrola renifolia
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://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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is significant to the scientific community because it presents research on the trophic relationships between plants and fungi using both morphological and modern molecular genetics techniques.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and complete.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript to be accurate in terms of science. There are no questions regarding how the experiments performed thanks to the methodology's extreme detail. Comparative photos of plants, fungus, and extensive tables are included in the manuscript.</p> <p>6. Yes, there are enough references, but there are also 4 dated references from the 1990s: (12), (13), (14) and (19). It is therefore recommended to swap them out with new versions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's English language quality, in my opinion, is appropriate for scholarly communications that demonstrate a strong scientific linguistic quality. The English language can be improved, though. For these reasons I suggest: 1) submit the manuscript for English grammar review by a professional English language specialist. 2) control and corrections using the grammarly with the Quillbot program, which also suggests simplifications and semantic corrections, see the web page: <https://quillbot.com/grammarcheckrammarchecker?utm_medium=paid_search&utm_source=google&utm_campaign=dsa_developing&campaign_type=search></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The conclusion appropriately addresses the study's goal, however it would be wise to emphasize the significance of this work for botany as a whole.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antônio Francisco de Sousa
Department, University & Country	E.E.E.P Dom Walfrido Teixeira Vieira, Brazil