

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_123392
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity and Taxonomic Classification of Epiphytes in the Federal Capital Territory, 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	The manuscript is going to be a potential resource for the scientists of plant taxonomy. The identification and type description of the epiphyte will be valuable to the scientific community for future reference. I like this manuscript for the way it is written without any grammatical mistakes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it 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 is comprehensive. There is no need for any modification.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate	
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.	The description on epiphytes and its characteristics is provided. The types have been well differentiated. The work has been concentrated on the epiphytes of all the plant taxa including fungi, bryophytes, etc The epiphytes on the study area is new.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, it is sufficient	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language was good for scholarly communication	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is written well. A very few spelling corrections marked in red. The scientific name spellings, I have corrected and marked in red.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>B Sankaran</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Presidency College, University of Madras, India</b>