

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	AsianPlantResearchJournal
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_APRJ_109946
Titleof theManuscript:	Reviewofthestateofknowledgeofthefloraof Vaupés(Colombia)
Typeof the Article	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'scomment (ifagreedwithreviewer, correct themanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthe manuscript.Itis mandatorythatauthorsshouldwrite his/herfeedbackhere)
<p>CompulsoryREVISIONcomments</p> <p>1. Isthemanuscript important forscientific community? (Please writefewsentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggest analternative title)</p> <p>3. Isthe abstract ofthearticle comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections andstructureofthemanuscriptappropriate?</p> <p>5. Doyou thinkthemanuscriptisscientificallcorrect?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficientandrecent?If you have suggestionofadditionalreferences,please mentioninthe reviewform.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free toprovide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- 1- Yes, thisarticleisof greatrelevanceto thescientificcommunity,especiallyregardingthe expansionoftraditionalbotanical knowledge inColombianandSouthAmericanareas.</p> <p>2- It shouldbenoted thatthe proposaltodemonstratetheconcentrationof publications between different areasofresearchis an excellentmilestonetobepromotedinother articles as itindicatesa possibilityof directingeffortsand/orsearchingforreferences regarding future research.</p> <p>3- 2- Thetitleisappropriateinrelationto the contentofthearticle.</p> <p>4- 3- Thesummaryisadequate. However,itmustbehighlightedthefactthattherewas notonly use ofbadarticles butalsoofvariousotherformsof scientificdisseminationliterature.</p> <p>5- 4- Yes, thedivisionsof thearticlearesuitablefor structuringthework.</p> <p>6- 5- Yes. Thearticleiswell constructed.</p> <p>7- 6- Yes. Regardingtheconstructionof search terms, I suggestyouread'Usingtheplants of BrazilianCerradoforwoundhealing:fromtraditionalusetoscientificapproach'</p>	
<p>MinorREVISIONcomments</p> <p>1. Islanguage/Englishqualityofthe articlesuitableforscholarly communications?</p>	<p>1- Smallgrammatical corrections arenecessaryregardingagreement.</p>	

ReviewForm 1.7

Optional/Generalcomments

The general terms used as search engines between the different scientific dissemination platforms are different from each other, so the results are also variable and do not reflect a single universe of results. I believe that it is necessary, using all the complementary evaluation methodology, to carry out new research on the same platforms using the same general terms as search engines.

In "Results and Discussions" the author mentions that "In the study, 92 publications were found whose study focus covered the Vaupés department. Of this total, 28% of publications corresponded to work exclusively related to the department." The written form leaves room to believe that the other articles found are not related to the Vaupés department, the initial reason and target of the work. If so, all others should be excluded from the evaluated sample.

In "3.1 Publications over the years" the author mentions that 8 intervals of 10 years each were created between the years 1944 and 2023, however, when analyzing "figure 1 Temporal Range in

ReviewForm 1.7

	<p>10-Year Frequency of Publications for the Department of Vaupés” we note that this division took place in the first interval from 1944 to 1954 while in the second from 1954 to 1964 being a constant repeated for the others until 2013 to 2024, however between one interval and another year such as 1954 is always repeated, 1964, 1974 successively so as not to make it clear where, the production of that year was added up and finally considered. If both intervals were added together, the value of 92 articles found is probably wrong and must be changed, meaning that all other data must also be revised. It is also necessary to take into account that we are in the year 2023, which makes the representation of expectations for the year 2024 wrong and must be changed throughout the article.</p> <p>For better representation, I recommend transforming the graph in Figure 1 into a table where the same data will be better visualized and highlighted.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Antônio Ribeiro Neto
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de São João, Brazil