

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_97772
Title of the Manuscript:	Floristic Assessment of Natural Regeneration, 8 years after Post-Remediation by Enhanced Natural Attenuation (p - RENA) of Hydrocarbon Impacted Land: A Window for Selection of Native Macrophyte with Remediation Potential.
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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, the Ms is exhaustive and need to be focussed on regeneration of vegetation in the study area. It is to be trimmed to 10-15 pages if possible to make it readable by the resereachers.  yes  No, it should be revised giving the aim and the conclusion of the study  Yes, but needs trimming  Yes  yes	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The MS is very lengthy and it is going to take lot of space in journal and 36 pages are a lot and test patience for readers. If the journal can afford space, it is ok.	

### 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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bijay K. Mohanty</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Khallikote University, India</b>