

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_121502
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPOLRATION OF SOME WILD FOOD PLANTS USED BY LOCAL PEOPLE OF KANGCHUP CHINGKHONG, SENAPATI DISTRICT OF MANIPUR
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The authors have very beautifully tried to explain their scientific work on "EXPOLRATION OF SOME WILD FOOD PLANTS USED BY LOCAL PEOPLE OF KANGCHUP CHINGKHONG, SENAPATI DISTRICT OF MANIPUR" focusing on the consumption of local food. This is very informative manuscript and contains data about the wild edible flora of Manipur District, India. This manuscript will help the scientific community to explore the ethnobotany in the said area for further exploration.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is very simple. It should be collective, sound and scientific so that it can be represented to scientific community attractively.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract shows the manuscript title in it. Secondly, the results shown are in percentage that should be in biostatistics language. Thirdly, the abstract is not comprehensive and it is lacking information. (150/300 words limit is not met)</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections are not according to the format. Study area map should be included. Area is not evaluated by altitude and latitude scale. Methodology of the manuscript is not clear. Which type of biostatistics authors have applied? No clear picture of the methodology is there.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Firstly, the English of the manuscript needs to be improved by an English expert. Secondly, no previous study of the said area is mentioned in the manuscript. Thirdly, in the discussion section, authors did not compare their results with any study. Fourth, a detailed table of previous recent studies should be added, claiming scientifically which part of the plant is beneficial or not.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Only six references are added in the manuscript and half of them are older than 10 years. Bibliography data is very low.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English of this manuscript is not appropriate and needs more perfection by an English expert.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors tried their best to explain the importance of local plant consumption in this manuscript. But from my viewpoint, this study needs a lot of improvements. In the introduction part, at least twenty latest relevant references should be added. In the methodology part, biostatistics should be applied and results should be mentioned in that language. In the results and discussion part, compare your results with previous relevant studies. Reference section guidelines are not followed and should be improved.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Aquib Nazar
Department, University & Country	School of Science, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan