

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_108451
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Phytoplankton and Zooplankton Diversity In the River Sabarmati, Gujarat, 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of moderate importance for the scientific community. It provides valuable insights into the diversity and abundance of phytoplankton and zooplankton in the Sabarmati River, which is relevant for understanding the health of aquatic ecosystems and monitoring water quality. However, the article lacks a clear statement of the broader significance of the findings and how they might contribute to our understanding of broader ecological or environmental issues.</p> <p>2. The title, "A Study of Phytoplankton and Zooplankton Diversity In the River Sabarmati, Gujarat, India," is suitable for the content of the article. It accurately reflects the focus of the research and the geographical area studied.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a general overview of the research, but it lacks key details. It briefly mentions the importance of phytoplankton and zooplankton, the study's location and duration, and the methods used. However, it does not summarize the key findings, making it less comprehensive. The abstract should provide a concise summary of the main results and their implications.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. The article is organized into sections for Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, the presentation of results, particularly in the Results and Discussion section, could be more concise and better organized. The discussion is somewhat repetitive and lacks a clear structure. It would benefit from a more systematic presentation of results and a more in-depth analysis of their implications.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of the methods employed and the data presented. The authors use standard sampling and analysis techniques for phytoplankton and zooplankton, and the results are reported clearly. Additionally, it would benefit from a more thorough explanation of the study's limitations and potential sources of bias.</p> <p>6. Consider adding references from the past two years to keep the literature review up-to-date.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The manuscript needs to improve the clarity of writing. Some sentences are convoluted and challenging to understand. A more concise and straightforward writing style would enhance the readability of the article. ▪ The article lacks a clear statement of the research's significance and how it contributes to the existing body of knowledge. ▪ The discussion section should be restructured to provide a more coherent and organized analysis of the results. ▪ It would be helpful to include a section on the practical implications of the research and how the findings can inform conservation and management efforts in the Sabarmati River and similar ecosystems. ▪ Overall, the article provides a foundation for understanding phytoplankton and zooplankton diversity in the Sabarmati River, but it needs significant revisions to improve clarity, depth, and scientific rigor. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The article could benefit from some improvements in language quality, organization, and clarity. Some sentences are long and complex, which might make it harder for readers to follow the text. Improving sentence structure and ensuring clarity in the presentation of data and results could enhance the article's readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Volodymyr Voloshynovych
Department, University & Country	Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University, Ukraine