

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_124960
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethnotaxonomy and ethnobotanical studies of honey and resinous plants in the Tchamba prefecture in Togo.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<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 manuscript on "Ethnotaxonomy and Ethnobotanical Studies of Honey and Resinous Plants in the Tchamba Prefecture in Togo" is important for the scientific community because it explores the interplay between biodiversity conservation, local knowledge, and plant usage. It provides a comprehensive understanding of how indigenous communities in Togo classify and utilize honey-producing and resinous plants, which is crucial for preserving both biodiversity and cultural heritage. The study's focus on vernacular phytonyms and traditional uses of plants highlights the importance of local knowledge systems in ecosystem conservation.</p> <p>I appreciate this manuscript because it fills a significant gap in ethnobotanical research, particularly in underrepresented regions like Togo, and emphasizes the role of traditional knowledge in biodiversity conservation. Additionally, its methodological approach involving local communities in plant classification makes it a valuable resource for researchers in ethnobiology, conservation, and sustainable agriculture.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Ethnotaxonomy and Ethnobotanical Studies of Honey and Resinous Plants in the Tchamba Prefecture in Togo", is generally suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the study on both ethnotaxonomy and ethnobotany.</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 of the article is generally informative and covers the key points, such as the objective, methods, and main findings of the study. However, it could be made more comprehensive and clearer by adding certain details and improving the structure. Here are a few suggestions:</p> <p>Clarify the objective: The abstract mentions the study's aim but could benefit from more explicit phrasing, such as highlighting the significance of preserving indigenous knowledge.</p> <p>Methods summary: The methods section could briefly mention the specific approaches used (e.g., "ethnotaxonomic surveys, semi-directed interviews") to give readers a clearer understanding of how the data was collected.</p> <p>Key findings: The results section should emphasize the significance of the findings more clearly, especially the diversity of plants identified and the importance of local knowledge in classification and use.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion could be strengthened by highlighting the practical implications of the findings, such as the potential for conservation or sustainable use of plant resources.</p> <p>Example: Natural plant products have gained increasing attention, but climate change and human activities have led to the degradation of ecosystems and loss of biodiversity. This study aims to contribute to the preservation of local knowledge related to the classification and use of honey-producing and resinous plants in the Tchamba prefecture, Togo. Ethnotaxonomic and ethnobotanical data were collected through semi-directed interviews and focus groups in four localities, involving 92 respondents. A total of 96 plants were identified, classified into 88 genera, 33 families, and 22 orders, with 16 ethnotaxonomic criteria used for classification. The most common criteria were "plant use" and "plant habit." The study highlights the rich local knowledge of plant uses for food, medicine, and rituals, emphasizing the importance of conserving both biodiversity and cultural heritage. These findings contribute to understanding how indigenous knowledge can support conservation and sustainable use of plant resources .</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate for a scientific study, as it follows a conventional format of presenting research.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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>The manuscript on "Ethnotaxonomy and Ethnobotanical Studies of Honey and Resinous Plants in the Tchamba Prefecture in Togo" demonstrates scientific robustness through its systematic methodology and comprehensive data collection. The use of semi-directed interviews and focus groups with local communities ensures that the research captures a wide range of local knowledge regarding plant classification and use. The floristic assessment, which includes the identification and classification of 96 plants across various genera and families, is methodologically sound and provides a solid foundation for the study's conclusions. Additionally, the inclusion of ethnobotanical criteria and the detailed analysis of vernacular phytonyms contribute to a nuanced understanding of the relationship between local communities and their natural environment, underscoring the manuscript's technical soundness and relevance to the field of ethnobotany.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript provide a mix of foundational studies and some recent works, which is good, but there are areas where the references could be updated or expanded for better context and support for the study. While the references cover relevant topics, a greater emphasis on more recent literature would strengthen the manuscript's foundation.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>My suggestions: Proofreading: A thorough proofreading session, possibly with the help of a native English speaker or a professional editor, would help identify and correct grammatical and stylistic errors. Sentence Structure: Simplifying complex sentences and breaking long sentences into shorter ones would improve clarity. Consistency: Ensure that terms are consistently used and adequately defined upon first mention. Formal Tone: Revise informal phrases to maintain a scholarly tone throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript does not appear to have any ethical issues.</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)
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ina Pasho</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Albania</p>