

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_131217
Title of the Manuscript:	BAMBOO PLANTS INVENTORY AT BARANGAY BAGANIHAN, MARILOG DISTRICT, DAVAO CITY: The First Step in the Adopted Community's LAB-BAYONG Sustainability Project
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study outcome will be helpful for the planners to know the available bamboo resources in the study area which will help to make further plan for community development. Soil analysis result will help the scientist to recommend requirement of soil nutrient and soil type to grow <i>Cephalostachyum mindorense</i> bamoo.	- Complied- Thank you
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title is suitable	- Complied. Thank you
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive and it has included all the required parts.	- Complied. Thank you.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientific name should be italicized it is missing in some parts of the manuscript. For Authentication of species identification consultation with herbarium or taxonomist is required and it is missing in the methodology section.	- Complied. - Scientific names were all italicized. (corrected were highlighted with yellow) - Taxonomist is included – See page 4 section 2.3 (corrected were highlighted with yellow)
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes reference section has major suggestions 1. Most of the references are missing in the running text but mention in the reference sections. It is required to match the reference both in running text and reference section 2. Reference should write as per proper format but it is incorrect for the following reference (Effects of Bamboo Forest Type and Density on the Growth of Bletilla striata and Root Endophytic Fungi by Hao Fu 1,2,Zhilin Song 2,Shanmin Li 1,Siren Lan 2,Xinhua Zeng 1,* andWeichang Huang 1,2,* Participatory Assessment of Bamboo Resources in Sre Thom and Chiklob CPAs and Sre Huy CCF, Mondulkiri Province. Feb 2014). Please correct it in proper format.	Complied. 1. All in text citations and details in the references were align. 2. References were written according to the format.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality is good and easily understandable.	- Complied. Thank you
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is informative for the scholars	- Complied. Thank you

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	