

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_107854
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTODIVERSITY OF HERBACEOUS FLORA IN THE GRASSLANDS OF JANNARAM DIVISION, KAWAL TIGER RESERVE, TELANGANA, INDIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript analysed the phytodiversity of the herbaceous flora of Jannaram Grasslands, which is certainly an addition to the existing knowledge of the flora of the study area. This manuscript has generated baseline data of the herbaceous layer of this region that will be used by forest officers, researchers, and for other scientific purposes. This article will be a good reference for authors working on inventorying the flora and diversity of the study area.</p> <p>2. Yes. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes. The abstract is comprehensive. However, the conclusion needs to be revised.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections are appropriate, but the titles are improper (Measuring of indices can be considered as a statistical analysis (Section 2.2): This section has been given the wrong title). The result is starting with a table directly. There should be some descriptive information before the table so that the flow of the manuscript is maintained.</p> <p>5. With few exceptions, the manuscript is written in a scientifically correct manner. However, there are some minor scientific mistakes that need to be corrected.</p> <p>6. The literature review is insufficient. There should be more recent references cited in support of results and discussion.</p> <p>1. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313065513 Ethnomedicinal plants of Kawal wildlife sanctuary Telangana India</p> <p>2. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307686372 Ecology and phytosociology of the tropical dry deciduous forests of Kawal Wildlife Sanctuary Telangana India</p> <p>3. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343650390 Studies on the phytosociology and plant diversity of a grassland ecosystem at Thoubal Thoubal district Manipur India</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes the English quality is good but some of the sentences can be reframed for better understanding of readers. Grammatical check is also required as there are some minor mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Inconsistency in formatting, font size, and styles are different in many places.</p> <p>2. A more extensive literature review (a few articles are already given in the comment part) should be carried out along with recent references.</p> <p>3. There is no mention of how plants were identified. Which flora was used for the same?</p> <p>4. There should be only two decimals in the scientific values of results (the IVI value of <i>Iseilema</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p><i>laxum</i> should be 29.94 instead of 29.935).</p> <p>5. There is no discussion of previous records of the study area. Is this the first attempt for the study area?</p> <p>6. Further analysis of flora like A/F ratio (Abundance by Frequency ratio), Similarity index, etc. given by Sorenson could have been carried out which would have given more insights into the diversity and phytosociological status of different species.</p> <p>7. The discussion should be in more detail. There is no mention of why different indices for the study area have been carried out and what interpretations can be drawn based on the values of a particular index. No reason is given why herbs have less dominance in the study area in spite of having high diversity.</p> <p>8. The conclusion can be reframed.</p> <p>9. Inconsistency in reference to formatting. The author needs to stick to a particular style of referencing.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Usha Pandya
Department, University & Country	Government College Daman, India