

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126677
Title of the Manuscript:	Floristic Checklist and Conservation Status of Woody Species in Relation to Gradient in Osomba Hills in Oban Forest of Cross River National Park, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Today the climatic changing are the principal preoccupation of governments in the world. Deforestation is more and more important in the sub-Saharan forest. For fighting against climatic changing, it is very important to manage and monitor these ecosystems. For that, scientist need for having database on biodiversity in these forests, and informations about their biology. Actual works, focus on knowledge on diversity and distribution of plant species for understanding the functioning of these ecosystems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. I suggest authors to begin by a Background, followed by Objectives and methodology before putting Results. Authors must also add Key-words after the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriated.	
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.	Firstly, this research article permitted for extending knowledge on plant diversities in forest ecosystems. Secondly, This research article can provide new species for completing database on species growing in forest. Thirdly, authors contributed to the ecological management system on forest.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but not recent.	
Minor REVISION comments	English language of the research article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>There are not key words</p> <p>Abstract is not complete and well organize. There are not : Background, objectives, methodology</p> <p>Cut the last paragraph of the introduction and past it in the methodology part, at the level of description of study site.</p> <p>What was the objectives of the study?</p> <p>No, There are not competing interest issues in this manuscript. No, there are not ethical issues in this manuscript.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ndjouondo Gildas Parfait
Department, University & Country	The University of Bamenda, Cameroon