



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRIB_48229</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Panax sp. in Tuyen Quang, North Vietnam – A Potential Plant for Poverty Reduction</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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	<p>Line 12: Should be indicated NOT indicate</p> <p>Line 13: Should be – as distributed in ...</p> <p>Lines 14 - 15: “The soil must ..... drainage” – Not clear. Please consider revising.</p> <p>Lines 16 - 19: Not clear</p> <p>Line 41: Should be - is located NOT “located”</p> <p>Line 48: Consider revising</p> <p>Lines 50 - 55: Clearly state the instruments of data collection, materials and equipment as well.</p> <p>Line 58: Make bold</p> <p>Line 59- 60: Re-phrase this. You may start with - a total number of ... locals ....</p> <p>Line 67: Make bold. Also consider using – Morphological and Anatomic Characteristics</p> <p><b>Line 68 – 70: Who identified and classified the plants?</b></p> <p>Line 71: Not clear</p> <p>Line 72: “was then colored” should be – was then stained.</p> <p><b>Line 74: which objective of the microscope?</b></p> <p>Line 76: Make bold</p> <p>Line 78: “were weighed” should be – was ALSO “n-hexan” should be n-hexane was...</p> <p>Line 80: “by soxhlet” should be – with soxhlet</p> <p>Line 85: “into” should be - in</p> <p>Line 93: Consider using - Tuyen Quang ginseng is naturally distributed in .....</p> <p>Line 101: Delete the word “Hance”</p> <p><b>Line 104 113: Did you carry out the tests or got literatures?</b></p> <p>Line 120: Description of root is not clear</p> <p>Line 130: “which is” should be - with</p> <p>Line 136 -137: Should be part of methodology</p> <p>Line 137: Should be – Results indicated</p> <p>Line 139: Should be - ... root indicated main ....</p> <p>Line 149 - 150: missing link</p> <p>Line 153: Should be – favourable condition</p> <p>Line 157: Delete the word “well”</p> <p>Line 160: Consider using – Morphological comparison of the five .....</p> <p>Line 163: Delete “while no.” Consider using –Number of flowers .....</p> <p>Line 176: Delete the word “before”</p> <p>Line 177: Consider using - .... Extensively in order to address the issue, also ensuring the quality ....</p> <p>NB: The conclusion should emphasize the high saponin content as the major economic factor thus, a strong support for the title of the article.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables 1 and 3 – No source.</li> <li>• Methodology should capture the mode/instruments of data collection in detail.</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for your comments and revisions. We fully addressed and are yellow highlighted in revision.</p> <p>Lines 68-70: first and third authors are taxonomists, responsible for plant identification and classification.</p> <p>Line 74: Using microscope for anatomy of aerial stem and root.</p> <p>Lines 104-113: we carried out the tests.</p> <p>Table 1 is our results from soil analysis. Part of Table 3 is our results, source of sited ones was added to Table 3.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Paper has good research methodology and based on rigorous academic standards	

**PART 2:**

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