



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Journal of Biology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_34533
Title of the Manuscript:	Assesment of phenology and morphological diversity of 3 species of Asteraceae : Anacyclus clavatus, Chamaemelum fuscatum and Leucanthemum parthenium
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Original scientific article should solve any scientific problem. So first of all the Authors are expected to indicate a problem, its importance and afterwards to phrase the research questions or hypothesis. Here the Authors should explain why they wanted to compare these 3 species in terms of phenology and morphological diversity. And the reader find no explanation.</p> <p>For studying morphological diversity, the sample of 10 individuals per species is definitely insufficient.</p> <p>For phenological studies it is correct but here the Authors should add meteorological data for the studied area. I would advise to focus on phenology – if the 3 species are cultivated or used for medicinal purposes the phonological data might be relevant.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Leszek Bednorz</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Botany, Poznan University of Life Sciences, Poland</i>