

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Innovations in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1897
Title of the Manuscript:	Wild Edible Plants (WEPs), Their Importance, Possible Threats, and Conservation
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	WEPs offer a fascinating glimpse into the rich biodiversity of our natural world and hold immense potential for improving human health and nutrition. Studying WEPs and promoting their conservation is crucial not only to preserve cultural heritage and traditional knowledge but also to ensure the sustainability of these plants for future generations. This topic is compelling as it bridges the gap between ecological preservation and human well-being, highlighting the intricate balance needed to maintain our natural resources.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need addition. 1. Importance of Wild Edible Plants must highlight Cultural Significance Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. 2. Some overview of hunger and malnutrition crisis from Global Hunger Index and relevance of WEPs with data and references 3. Threats and challenges are not properly highlighted. 4. Suggest some management techniques like domestication of WEPs as a Agri-forestry, engaging youth in sustainable harvesting, processing and marketing etc. 5. Some recommendation must be highlighted.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it is grounded in a comprehensive literature review, drawing from various reputable databases such as Scopus, WOS, Springer, and Elsevier, ensuring a broad and credible base of information. Additionally, the manuscript's clear structure, detailed references, and critical analysis demonstrate a thorough and methodical approach to the topic, enhancing its scientific reliability.	

Review Form 2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Go through the reports of Global Hunger Index and add some relevant data related to importance of WEPs to combat hunger crisis with data and reference.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	If possible make it more impressive.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Tara Devi Sen
Department, University & Country	Vallabh Goverment College, India