



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 	
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.	



[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:	Wilton Mbinda
Department, University & Country	Pwani University, Kenya