

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal.</p> <p>2. Title should be shortened</p> <p>3. For readers to quickly catch your contribution, it would be better to highlight major difficulties and challenges, and your original achievements to overcome them, in a clearer way in abstract and introduction. Abstract should be informative and include the main findings. It would be proper if the authors should link the vegetation landscape in the study area to the geology or other sources in the area.</p> <p>4. Subsection are adequate</p> <p>5. the manuscript is scientifically sound.</p> <p>7. Please be selective but representative with referencing and with no more than 40-45 citations for a regular paper. On the other hand, many of the 76 literatures you used were not validated which is bad. Try to reduce this.</p> <p>Phosphorus which is rapidly absorbed by plants and is drawn by the sediment like a sink. The age of the sediment affects its phosphorus content and whether it is of inorganic or organic origin. Please refer to the following literature on this subject. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-7345.2002.tb00499.x</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is not bad but best polished by native English speakers.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the study is rich in data and supported by statistics, and indexes. However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains serious weaknesses. The language is not bad but best polished by native English speakers. However, the authors need to consider the following questions, some of which are clearly flawed and may be difficult to meet publication standards without addressing them well. Fig. 1: Rivers State showing study area- Emohua and Fig. 2.: Emohua study area showing study location - Ibaa " were is not adequate drawing to show the study area. The location of the study place in the world is uncertain. Even its place in the country is uncertain. A simple google earth excerpt. A more professional location map should be drawn. Improvements are required for the tables and figs.</p> <p>The discussion section in the present form is relatively weak and should be strengthened with more details and justifications.</p> <p>Please check for typo/grammar (many places).</p> <p>In the conclusion section, the limitations of this study, suggested improvements of this work and future directions should be highlighted.</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:	Yalçın Tepe
Department, University & Country	Giresun University, Turkey