

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_110704</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ex-situ conservation of Palms with special reference to endemic and IUCN Red List species in Acharya Jagadish Chandra Bose Indian Botanic Garden, Howrah, India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. This manuscript will provide new insights on the collected species in AJCBIBG, some of which are found extinct in the wild. Thus, it serves as an important place for ex-situ conservation of palm germplasm.</p> <p>2. The title seems to be appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract needs further improvement from the current writeup. I observed only the aim and study area in the abstract. All other components are missing. Please write a robust abstract which encompasses all the aspects of your paper. The authors can refer standard paper works.</p> <p>4. Most of the sub-sections seems fine. When it comes to the literature review, is it necessary to write separately like a thesis work? Manuscripts usually are written with literature review incorporated into the introduction part.</p> <p>5. The scientific approach is correct.</p> <p>6. The references are fine.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Revision made</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English language quality in the article needs a small effort for improvement, even though, the paper is well written.</p>	<p>ok</p>
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		

## PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	