

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_110874
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Diversity and Distribution Pattern of Pteridophytic flora in Dunumadalawa Forest Reserve in Kandy District, Sri Lanka
Type of the Article	

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The research topic is currently very important to explore Diversity and Distribution Pattern of Pteridophytic flora	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article title is suitable	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	No, the abstract of the article is reflecting the summary of literature review, rather than the present findings of a research. It also not clearly summarize the methods, findings, and its conclusion	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It need more modification to arrange subsections and structure of the manuscript, particularly in <b>material and method, and results and discussion parts</b> are required revision	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Somewhat it need revision to clearly disseminate information to scientific communities, and to keep journal quality protocol in scientific perspective	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Some of references, particularly with related to journal articles are <b>old</b> in research findings, i.e. before 2000 G.C or more than 20 years information. Therefore, these required to revise and update with current scientific information.	
<b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	In the section of material and methods, a researcher should be incorporate the sub-heading of <b>the study area</b> map, <b>Sampling Design</b> , <b>sampling method</b> , and <b>statistical analysis</b> to follow the scientific manuscript writing format to disseminate full information to scientific communities.	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is better to revise a manuscript text part by using strong and appropriate terminologies to clearly reflect the subject matter to subject matter specialist scholars</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The author/s/ should clearly understand how to prepare the manuscript for publication based on the specific journal guideline before going to submit the manuscript.</li> </ul> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The abstract is not fulfill the criteria and clearly indicate the findings of the research</li> <li>▪ Abstract is not simply copping it from some part of the paper and it should clearly have indicated why the research conducted, how it conducted and what is the findings of the research, and finally, what recommendation drawn and forwarded based on the findings</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The introduction part gives information about the research but in this manuscript, it is shallow message, and not concentrated to the points based on the title of the research</li> <li>✓ Mostly, the author/s/ used very <b>old citation</b> in which the reality of the findings changed from time to time</li> </ul> <p><b>Methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The methodology of the research followed is not clear for reader</li> <li>✓ The design, and sampling procedure of the research is not clearly stated and study population also not consistent</li> <li>✓ No statistical tools are used to analyze the result.</li> </ul> <p><b>Result and discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The specific objectives of the research set are not met as example specific objective of diversity, species richness, and conservation measures.</li> <li>✓ The ways of result presentation are generally poor</li> <li>✓ The findings of the research are not discussed with previously related studies</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ the conclusion set is not clearly concluded in line with the result obtained</li> </ul>	

**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>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:	<b>Yadesa Bato Ejeta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ambo University, Ethiopia</b>