



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Geographical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJGR_47079 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Botany of Mungo Park's Travels in Africa, 1795-1806 |
| Type of the 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is difficult to assess the content as <u>no reason</u> was put forth for this review (should be clarified). Thus the reason for <u>the interplay</u> between historical data (1795- , 1805-) and contemporary information (2014?) is unknown and should be clarified. Because of the above readers are unsure as to the shape and intend of the paper. 2. The title indicate the Botany of Mungo Parks, yet vast amounts of information is presented that is either Historical (where he was born...), Anthropological or Sociological accounts (where Parks slept, who was with him, how many died etc.) that have no relevance to botanical data or the interpretation thereof. Thus in its current form the paper is neither here (Botanical) nor there (Historical, Anthropological or Sociological). 3. The interplay between Historical data (1795- , 1805-) and contemporary information (2014?) MUST be separated via reference sources – most contemporary information are not properly cited for the sources (see for example page 2 paragraph 2 “His observations on the regional ...” 4. The 2014 information – already 5 years old - (see photos etc.) are not explained in terms of: Where did it come from, how was it obtained, how it was analysed etc. 5. Extremely long paper – could possibly be significantly shortened via the removal of non-botanical information (see comment 2 above) 6. Significant amounts of non-botanical Information have no value to the botanical understanding of this paper – for example Figures 6 & 7, 11 etc. page 7 “... a detailed map produced later ...” “ page 15: “ There was a famine in the land...” Why do we NEED to know this information to understand the botanical information of Park? 7. Grammar is below the quality of what is expected at this level – The manuscript should be professionally proofread before a next submission 8. Technical aspects need attention – for example: Page 5: “...Zea mais) [Zea mays L.) – just too many issues to list here. 9. The 2014 data (photos) contain intellectual property or property or people – the issue of consent should be clarified. A photo cannot be taken of people without their consent (for example: Fig 17). | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | <i>Martin Potgieter</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>University of Limpopo, South Africa</i> |