

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126426
Title of the Manuscript:	Life Form Spectrum and Phytoclimatic Analysis of Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary, Rajasthan, India
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the diversity of plant life forms and the ecological characteristics of Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary, a region often overlooked in ecological studies. By employing Raunkiaer's classification system, the research not only contributes to the understanding of local biodiversity but also highlights the adaptive strategies of plants in arid environments. Such findings are essential for conservation efforts, particularly in the context of climate change, making this research both informative and relevant to the scientific community. Furthermore, as indicated in the title, the manuscript aims to enrich the scientific community's knowledge regarding plant life form diversity in Rajasthan, India, and contribute to the existing database. Unfortunately, upon reviewing the manuscript, it appears to fall short of the expectations set by its title and contains numerous deficiencies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is appropriate as it clearly conveys the main focus of the study—plant life form spectrum and phytoclimatic analysis in a specific geographical location. However, a more descriptive title could be: "Diversity and Adaptation of Plant Life Forms in Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary: A Phytoclimatic Analysis."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is informative but should include more detail regarding the methodology and specific results. It is essential to mention some of the most important characteristics of the study area, such as climate, geomorphology, and vegetation formations. Additionally, expanding the methodology section to include sampling techniques and data analysis methods, as well as summarizing key results quantitatively, would enhance clarity and strengthen the abstract's overall impact. Including a brief mention of the ecological implications of the findings would further improve its relevance.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections that guide the reader through the introduction, study area, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This organization facilitates understanding and allows for a logical flow of information. The use of tables to present data is also appropriate and enhances readability.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript has numerous deficiencies and does not merit publication. It is not scientifically robust, as it fails to employ established classification systems and appropriate methods for data collection and analysis. The representation of different life forms is insufficient. Furthermore, the discussion does not link the findings to broader ecological theories, indicating a lack of understanding of plant adaptations in arid climates. Overall, the research is not technically sound and does not contribute meaningfully to the field of plant ecology.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are minimal and contain numerous deficiencies. While they provide a foundational understanding of plant life forms and ecological analysis, the majority of the references are dated, with only a few recent studies cited. Here are some observations and suggestions:</p> <p>Observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity of References: The references cover a range of relevant topics, including life form classifications, biological spectra, and ecological analyses. This diversity helps contextualize the research. Age of References: Many key references date back several decades (e.g., Humboldt 1886, Raunkiaer 1934, and Meher-Homji 1964). While foundational, more recent studies would strengthen the manuscript's relevance to current research trends. Methodological References Consider citing studies that detail methodologies for assessing biological spectra or ecological assessments, which could provide additional support for the methods used in this study. <p>In summary, while the references are sufficient for foundational context, incorporating more recent studies and additional regional works will enrich the manuscript and improve its relevance to</p>	

Review Form 3

	contemporary research in plant ecology and biodiversity.	
	<p>Other observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the "Study Area" section, it should be well-detailed (climate, temperature, humidity, precipitation, etc.), soil (texture, structure, etc.), and vegetation (existing plant formations, dominant species, etc.). - In Figure 1, "Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary Map," the map is not clear and lacks necessary information. - The "Materials and Methods" section is not clear at all; it should include much more detail about the methods used. - The results section is insufficient; it lacks actual results and completely misses histograms or tables to help understand your work. - The discussion is minimal and insufficient; it does not contain results from scientific work or comparisons of results. - The conclusion is inadequate; it needs to be more detailed, especially emphasizing the most important results and also providing perspectives and recommendations. <p>Decision on the article: The article does not merit publication at this time, as it contains many shortcomings. I express serious major reservations about this article.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but it does contain some grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. These issues could affect clarity and readability. Addressing these faults through careful editing would improve the manuscript's professionalism. Overall, with revisions, it could meet academic standards more effectively.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Boukerker Hassen
Department, University & Country	Scientific and Technical Research Center on Arid Regions CRSTRA, Algeria