



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARRB_50410 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Taxonomical investigation on some species of genus <i>Allium</i> based on the pollen grain micromorphology |
| 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>)

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the manuscript needs to be rewritten to avoid repetitions. Abstract aim: consider changing: 'The aim of this research was to investigate the micromorphological characteristics of the pollen grains of some species of genus <i>Allium</i> based on the pollen grain micromorphology'. Avon abbreviations in the abstract if possible. You may introduce them in the introduction section. Abstract Results. Does not specifically tell the results obtained in the study. Rewrite Abstract Conclusion: this is not conclusion but part of the results. Rewrite 13: Monocotyledons should be in small caps 17-18: Poorly constructed sentence. Has no meaning and so vague. Repetition of 'sophisticated' The whole of introduction section should be rewritten with correct English grammar. MATERIAL AND METHODS: should also be rewritten with correct grammar, avoiding long sentences. Terminology for LM and SEM observations were explored accrording to the following references [17, 18, 19]. -this is vague. What does it mean? RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: well written but can be improved with correct English grammar and avoidance of long sentences. Check spelling mistakes too. CONCLUSION: good Table and Figures. Well done | The manuscript has been modified |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript may be accepted for publication. However, I can understand that English is not the first language of the authors. It should therefore be subjected to professional editing before any consideration for publication. | |



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? | <u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> | |