

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_100714
Title of the Manuscript:	Unveiling the Ecological Tapestry: Flora Characteristics and Diversity in the Banas River Corridor, Gujarat
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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The study is an important contribution to the knowledge of body in ecological diversity, especially in the face of ever-increasing threats to biodiversity.</p> <p>The title does not reflect the content of the manuscript: the paper dwells more on ecological diversity, and nothing on floral characteristics</p> <p>No. The abstract does not highlight the problem, purpose of the study, main findings and conclusions.</p> <p>The subsections could be presented in accordance to the objectives of the study, which unfortunately are not explicitly stated.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, there are issues to be clarified: -Floristic composition (e.g. in terms of species, genera, and families) of the studies trees and shrubs -species which are listed as rare, vulnerable and data deficient in the area -Justification for the four zones – gradient: give the gradient for each zone -Study sites on map not provided. -Need to perform a randomisation test on the observed differences in species diversity.</p> <p>No references cited in the entire introduction section.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Good enough.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Peter Bismarck Olanya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gulu University, Uganda</b>