Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Botany**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIB_130546**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Floristic Inventory of the sudanian zone of the Ngoltongo Botanical Garden at Sindia, Mbour Department, Senegal**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**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.	I have thoroughly checked and assess the Paper and I think this is an interesting work, with a lot of valuable information, which is certainly worthy for the Pharmacologist, genetics ethno botanists, resource managers, foresters and conservationists at both national an international level.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes exactly it good and interesting.**	
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.	The abstract section is well presented.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes off course the manuscript is well and scientifically presented.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, references are insufficient but good and recent references are added.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and qualitatively article too good. Communication skill is up to the mark.	
Optional/General comments	.1 ***Appropriateness of the research topic***: up to the mark and suit the applied aspect of the related study. 2. ***Abstract***: Abstract section is too good and beautifully presented 3. I***ntroduction***: this section is too good. Old references are add. Few typo errors need correction through care full proofreading. 4. ***Materials and Methods:*** MM section is incomplete. 5. ***Results*** The results have not been logically presented and explained in detail. Tables of the study are incomplete. Make the floristic list clear and neat. Add the life form and leaf size are too important. The authentication should not be italic make them correct pattern. 6. ***Discussion***: Discussion portion is too weak. Make this section stronger . 7. ***References*:** Suggestion of proofreading of references given in the review chapter with the references given at the end.	

Review Form 3

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mujeeb Ur Rahman**
Department, University & Country	**University of Peshawar, Pakistan**