

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_106206
Title of the Manuscript:	Ecology and Distribution Pattern of Insectivorous plant in Sanjay Dubri Tiger Reserve Sidhi (M.P.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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. Although at first glance it seems to bring novelties to the scientific community, the way they are presented the information in the text is somewhat confusing and perplexing. The manuscript needs to be extensively reworked to make it easier to understand and to serve the purpose for which it was achieved.</p> <p>2. The title seems misleading. The Ecology and Distribution Pattern of Insectivorous plant in Sanjay Dubri Tiger Reserve Sidhi (M.P.)" must be changed to be more focused and particular. For example: Notes on the occurrence of an insectivorous plant in the Sanjay Dubri Sidhi Tiger Reserve</p> <p>3. No, must be require revision to enhance the coherence of the information provided. Sections (Purpose of the work, Methodology, Major results and Conclusion) are not separate please separate</p> <p>4. Consistency in the presentation of concepts and the way they are expressed in writing is required in any scientific paper. To some extent, this reasoning or logic is flawed in the present study.</p> <p>5. References must be improved and enhanced</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1 A language check of the manuscript is mandatory.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main purpose of the research must be stated at the end of the introductory section. The content and findings presented in the Discussion and Results section do not match the title of the study. The authors' presentation of the results lacks clarity and logical coherence in explaining their research findings. In addition, the authors have not provided any indication in this section of how the results relate to or contradict the findings of previous research or expectations. The Materials and Methods section needs to be strengthened as well as condensed and focused. The consistency of citation formats must be checked throughout the manuscript. The reference list must rigorously adhere to the journal's format!!!! Scientific names must be followed by the author's name Additional corrections/comments are applied with track changes in the revised text attached. 	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamid Khamar
Department, University & Country	Mohammed V University, Morocco