

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103769
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Plant diversity in Nawab Wajid Ali Shah Zoological Garden, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Overall, the data reported in this paper are valuable and appear to be collected using rigorous and repeatable methods. However, this manuscript does not appear to be a research paper, but a survey of existing vegetation. There is no research question/objective beyond, "the data have not been collected before at this site".</p> <p>The results provide a snapshot of the site's current biodiversity and would be a useful addition to the "Botanical Survey Volumes" published by the State, but there is no discussion of the study results in the context of the literature, nor comparison with any other variables. It could certainly be used as a baseline for comparison in future research.</p> <p>The implications beyond this site & study are unclear and thus it doesn't meet the criteria of a peer-reviewed research article, in my estimation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are multiple grammatical issues throughout the paper, including run-on sentences, inappropriate capitalization of words mid-sentence, and word choice. It should be proofread for English grammar.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julie Wilson
Department, University & Country	The University of British Columbia, Canada