



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_48229
Title of the Manuscript:	Panax sp. in Tuyen Quang, North Vietnam – A Potential Plant for Poverty Reduction
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory 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>Line 68 – 70: Who identified and classified the plants?</p> <p>Line 71: Not clear</p> <p>Line 72: “was then colored” should be – was then stained.</p> <p>Line 74: which objective of the microscope?</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>Line 104 113: Did you carry out the tests or got literatures?</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"> • Tables 1 and 3 – No source. • Methodology should capture the mode/instruments of data collection in detail. 	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Paper has good research methodology and based on rigorous academic standards	

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:	Ogundeko, Timothy Olugbenga
Department, University & Country	Bingham University, Nigeria