

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110948
Title of the Manuscript:	Unveiling indigenous traditional knowledge (ITKs) using different available plants by the local people of South Sikkim, India
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The author(s) presented a well-robust manuscript important for scientific community and to other readers. 2. Title of the manuscript would have been written as “Unveiling indigenous traditional knowledge (ITKs) using different available plants by the local people of South Sikkim, India” 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive, however, the author(s) should add more keywords to the text. 4. The author(s) has/have written all the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriately to attract other researchers 5. The manuscript is scientifically written and partially correct 6. The references insufficient. Most the references in the list are not cited in the text such as (CRESP 2008, Sueja 2006, Yumnam 2008, Uprety 2012, Stevenson 2005, Turner and Berks 2006). Also some references cited in the text are not in the reference list, such as (Barkakali 2023, Boruah 2023, Deka 2006, DeLC 2014, Nath 2017, and Pramanik 2021). Date of publication should be written after names of author(s) eg (Handy et al 2023) 1. OVERALL, the paper is robustly well-written and easy to follow, but the authors should proofread, consider most of the spelling errors which some are highlighted in yellow / green colours, grammar, and punctuation should be corrected in some of the sections to enhance the clarity and organization of the paper. 2. The author should discuss the result referring to his findings. Example: this is in agreement to the findings of, (Handy et al; 2023). Also. is similar to the findings of, (X and Y; 2020). 3. The author(s) should add recommendation, Acknowledgement if any and if there is conflict of interest. 4. The author(s) should provide ORCID id in the revised copy. He can register for an orcid id for free via https://orcid.org.	1. The present study will help in preserving the traditional knowledge & documentation of these ITKs can contribute towards scientific community & help other readers. 2. The authors have no objection towards the change in title of the manuscript. 3. Some more keywords have been added. 4. – 5. – 6. Proper references for all the citation have been updated by the authors. 1. All the highlighted required corrections have been corrected by the authors. 2. The results have been properly discussed with suitable findings by the authors. 3. - 4. -
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used is easy to follow and the quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications and other Researchers	
Optional/General comments	GOOD	

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)	-