

# Review of: "An Ecological Study of *Alstonia Venenata* R.Br. (Apocynaceae: Rauvolfioideae) and *Cryptolepis Buchanani* R.Br. Ex Roem. & Schult. (Apocynaceae: Periplocoideae)"

Susana Adriana Montaña-Arias<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana - Iztapalapa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Given the current scenarios of vegetation loss for various reasons, studies of little-known species or species with restricted distributions increase their relevance, which is why I consider that this manuscript presents a topic of interest. However, I have several suggestions that could be addressed to give greater support and robustness to the research. Given that any article coming from research must be able to be replicated, I allow myself to make the following suggestions:

1. Check the name of the species *A. venenata*, since there is an error on line 3.
2. The introduction must be reinforced, since the problem is not clear, and it does not justify why these two species were chosen. You should also try to integrate information, since some paragraphs seem like a summary of what someone else posted.
3. Materials and methods must be more specific. Although they comment that the investigation was only based on observations, it is necessary that they indicate how many, at what times, how they were carried out, etc. Likewise, I have the question: Do species cohabit? Or do their environments have the same conditions? Why were the observations made from March to June? From the phenology, but do both species have the same? Nothing should be left up in the air, so as not to fall into speculation.
4. In the results, they give descriptions of the stem, leaves, flower, fruit, etc., but how many individuals did they sample? How many leaves, flowers, and fruits? And what was observed? Also, what terminology did they use to make the descriptions? One thing that caught my attention is "Glabrous ovary, with clothing" - how is that?
5. In Considerations and discussion, I suggest changing "considerations" to "results." I also suggest not using ambiguous terms such as "high, low, little, etc." I suggest that data be incorporated.
6. It is suggested to review the entire manuscript and complete the species with the name of the authority *A. academica*).
7. It is suggested that the manuscript be reviewed in detail and that, where temperatures and/or elevations are mentioned, the value be placed and not just say high or low, since it is somewhat ambiguous.
8. The title says "Ecology of..." but it is not known how many individuals were sampled and if they are representative of

the population. For this reason, I suggest that the title change to: "Morphological Study of...."

9. The conclusions are in accordance with the objective but are a faithful copy of some ideas from other sections.

Therefore, I suggest reviewing and writing from an integrative perspective (both species), so as not to address the species separately and, above all, to consider what implications the types of fertilization would have.