

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_118863
Title of the Manuscript:	Revised Classification of Pteridophytes of Ethiopia and Eritrea
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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It could indeed be significant for the scientific community, especially for botanists, ecologists, conservationists, and anyone studying fern biodiversity in the region.</p> <p>Classification of Lycophytes and Ferns of Ethiopia and Eritrea, according to the Pteridophyte Phylogeny Group (PPG) – I.</p> <p>Needs Improvement</p> <p>Okay</p> <p>No, follow comments for improvement.</p> <p>No, recent diversity research on Pteridophytes in study area is not adequately covered in the references.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs to improve</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Here are some comments the author should consider to improve the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors have indicated that field collections were conducted, yet the methodology section lacks comprehensive details on the process. It is essential to provide specifics about the field collection, including the exact locations, dates, and methods used for collecting specimens. Additionally, the methodology should specify that the collected specimens were identified and deposited in the [Herbarium Name, Institution, Location] for future reference and verification. 2. Remove the extraneous introduction and focus on summarizing the previous research on Pteridophyte diversity specific to the study area. Include a comprehensive review of the global advancements in Pteridophyte classification. Explain the importance of this study and its significance for the scientific community. 3. It is evident that the author has primarily relied on the "Flora of Ethiopia and Eritrea – Vol I" as the sole source for data collection. Given that their source was published in 2009, what about other sources that have been published since then? There is a possibility of an increase in the number of species in the study area. The author should review and reference all relevant literature up to the present date to provide an accurate count of the total number of species. 4. The study area map lacks GPS coordinates, a scale bar, and a direction arrow. To improve the map's utility, please include these essential elements. 	

Review Form 1.7

	5. Sentences are repeated in introduction as well as in methodology section. avoid repetitions. 6. Families are not arranged according to the PPG I classification.	
--	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bagathsingh. C
Department, University & Country	ICFRE-Institute of Forest Genetics and Tree Breeding, India