

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 | |

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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> |
|--|--|---|
| 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. | This manuscript gives valuable insights into the biodiversity and plant ecological adaptations within the Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary (BWS) using Raunkiaer's classification system. It contributes to understanding the region's unique phytoclimate, which is essential for conservation and management efforts in arid and semi-arid ecosystems. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | That's okay | |
| 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. | The abstract is well-written and comprehensive | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The structure is appropriate, with clear subsections covering the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. | |
| 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. | This manuscript is scientifically sound and robust. The methodology is well-defined, with extensive field surveys and a clear application of Raunkiaer's classification system. Additionally, the discussion is grounded in ecological principles, making the study reliable for further applications in conservation. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | There are some lacking. It feels like a very old reference. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Okay | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

Review Form 3

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: | Nazmin Akter |
| Department, University & Country | Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Bangladesh |