

**Review Form 3**

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

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's comments</p> <p>1. Abstract and Introduction: There are also some typographical and grammatical errors that need to be corrected. Example, "Expolration" instead of "Exploration." The introduction tried to contextualize the importance of wild food plants; however, it requires a clearer statement of the research gap.</p> <p>2. Material and Methods: It is important to add the map and geographic coordinated of the study area. The demographic data of the informants are somewhat unclear, particularly the table format, which could be more reader friendly. There was a column for 'Knowledgeable individuals', how did you measure their knowledge or what criteria did you use? What age range constitute of elderly individuals? How did you eliminate bias in sampling the responders of your questionnaire?</p> <p>3. Results and Discussion: The results section listed the plant species, their families, local names, parts used, and ethnobotanical applications. The discussion compares the findings with previous studies, providing a good context. However, it will be better to explain more on the implications of the findings, especially regarding conservation and sustainable use of these plants.</p> <p>4. Conclusion: The conclusion succinctly summarizes the findings and underscores the need for further investigation into the Phyto-constituents of the documented plants. However, it could be strengthened by suggesting specific future research directions or practical applications of the study.</p> <p>5. References: The references are relevant but could include more recent studies to provide an updated context. Some references are incomplete or lack detailed citation formats.</p> <p>Recommendations for Improvement</p> <p>1. Language and Presentation: The manuscript needs extensive English language review and/or thorough proofreading to correct typographical and grammatical errors. Improving the readability of tables and figures would enhance the presentation of data.</p> <p>2. Depth of Analysis: The discussion section could provide a more in-depth analysis of the results, particularly in relation to the nutritional and medicinal potential of the documented plants.</p> <p>3. Broader Implications: The study should explore the broader implications of its findings for conservation, local food security, and the potential for domestication of wild plants.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Accept after major revision</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Obianuju Chiamaka Emmanuel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Horticultural Research Institute, Nigeria</b>