

**Subject: Major revisions requested: KEWB126**

**Sender:** Astrid Huizer KEWB

**Recipient:** pwidodo@unsoed.ac.id

**Date:** Thu 23:34

Dear Pudji,

We have now received the reviews of your manuscript, "Two new species of *Syzygium* (Myrtaceae) from Sumatra", which you submitted to Kew Bulletin.

I regret your manuscript is not acceptable for publication in its present form and extensive revision will be needed. Once this revision is complete you may resubmit. The manuscript will then be subject to further review.

When preparing your resubmission, you are asked to carefully consider the reviewers' comments below, and submit a list of responses to these comments. Please submit your responses as separate submission item.

In order to resubmit your manuscript, please access the following web site:

<http://kewb.edmgr.com/>

Your username is: pwidodo

Your password is: widodo7268

We look forward to receiving your manuscript by 1 December 2009.

Kind regards,  
David Simpson  
Editor in Chief

#### COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer #1: General comments.

I would be wary about describing, from only single specimens, new species. It has been done in the past in this genus and so may be OK here but there has to be a clear discussion of how these species differ from others that are similar and it is simply not good enough to say that the affinities are unclear and leave it at that. It is also worrying that no fruits - even immature ones have been seen, but again this is the case for other species described in this genus. If there is some discussion of affinities that would be OK.

It is fair enough, as it is a matter of opinion, as to whether a calyptrate calyx is a generically linked character or not and therefore it is ok to stuff these into *Syzygium* but at least some discussion of why they are properly placed in this genus would be good - especially as the authors seem to accept *Jambosa* as a plausible entity. Clearly, at least I think clearly, the authors are adopting a broad approach to *Syzygium*.

In terms of the differentiating characters they are probably OK but more, potentially taxonomically important, characters are available from the material and should be taken from the collections and added in. For example, what are the stomata like? Are the petals or indeed any part of the inflorescence glandular and if they are how glandular are they? How many lateral veins are there on average? The stamens are present - how many are there and what is the connective like and how big is it? Why does the English description not mirror exactly the latin?

Are there no data - or guesstimates - estimating population size or even the number of populations - there is some comment on this I know but do the field notes say nothing?

Why is Eve Lucas cited as an author when the authorities of both species appear to be the primary author alone. Her role needs to be clarified or she should be an author of the taxa.

There are a number of small typos etc. which need to be corrected.

Unfortunately, the plates are not good enough.

Detailed comments

Introduction.

In paragraph 1.

This estimate of the number of species is, I am afraid, wrong - see Parnell et al. (2007) - which provides a more likely estimate. You could cite both figures as a range I suppose.

Reword as follows

'The current concept' . 'and the calyx' 'A recent revision'

Paragraph 4 to read in its entirety.

'A systematic revision of the entire genus is highly desirable but logistically very difficult. A geographical approach such as this one, revising species occurring in biogeographically distinct areas such as Sumatra, will provide much badly needed information allowing for more effective conservation and increasing awareness of Sumatra's biodiversity.'

Paragraph 5

'in describing'. OK but what collections have been studied and how many specimens have been surveyed.

In the *Syzygium bohorokense* Widodo sp. nov. section

Under NOTES text to read

'and yellowish winged peduncles'

Under conservation status - text to read

'The forest surrounding'

and

'However, this area'

In the *Syzygium padangense* Widodo sp. nov. section

'NOTES' not NOTE and to read

'the inflorescence'

'S.' padangense not 'S' padangense

In conservation status to read

'southernmost'

and

'making it impossible'

Also has the specimen in A been seen or not?

In the Acknowledgements text to read

'is acknowledged for permission'

and

'is thanked for the references. Sunari and Afandi kindly provided the line drawings.'

there is a missing bracket after University.

The drawings are, I am afraid, not good enough and one in particular is unconvincing. That of *Syzygium bohorokense* does not show the:

Twigs terete and slightly compressed below nodes;

the leaves rounded being longitudinally wrinkled in herbarium material;

the dark oil dots numerous between major lateral veins, >100 per cm<sup>2</sup>;

the single intramarginal vein at base dividing into 2 near the middle.

For padangense

I cannot see the 2 intramarginal veins;

the petiole in the lower leaves looks thickened but there is no mention of this in the latin description though it is in the English and is probably an important character;

the leaves do not look abruptly acuminate which is what the latin says - the English says shortly acuminate which is correct

## Reviewer #2: Overview

The ms. has fundamental shortcomings and requires considerable revision. See main comments below and comments and editorial suggestions on the ms.

## Main Comments

1. Both species are described from a single collection. Owing to the large number of species in *Syzygium*, and the lack of convincing evidence that

these are indeed new species, it would seem foolhardy to accept their status. More evidence is required, with thorough discussion of the characters that have been selected as critical for the description of the new species. What are the implications of the selected key characters? What is their distribution in the genus? If the affinities are unclear does this mean that other species have not been properly reviewed? Have these species been compared to species from other areas and if so where? To the untutored eye the new species look very similar to many of the other *Syzygium* species from SE Asia.

'*Syzygium bohorokense* is a distinctive species characterized by the thick leaves drying yellowish, coherent petals, and yellowish winged peduncle (dried herbarium material). The affinities of this species are not clear.'

coherent petals, and yellowish winged peduncle (dried herbarium material). The affinities of this species are not clear.'

'*Syzygium padangense* is very distinctive small tree characterized by slender, flexible twigs, leaves yellowish drying, and with inflorescence solitary or in clusters or crowded slightly above the axis of the leaf. The affinities of this species are not clear.'

2. The descriptions are very short, inconsistent in format, and many key features not described and/or measured.

3. The IUCN assessments do not adhere to guidelines set out by the IUCN and require careful revision (see comments on ms.).