

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 offers significant insights into the diversity of plant life forms and the ecological features of Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary, a region frequently neglected in ecological research. By utilizing Raunkiaer's classification system, the study not only enhances the understanding of local biodiversity but also emphasizes the adaptive strategies of plants in arid conditions. Such findings are crucial for conservation initiatives, particularly in the context of climate change, rendering this research both informative and pertinent to the scientific community. However, upon careful review, the manuscript seems to fall short of the expectations suggested by its title and reveals several notable 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 fitting, as it effectively communicates the primary focus of the study—an analysis of plant life forms and phytoclimatic conditions in a specific geographical context. A more descriptive alternative 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, while informative, requires more detail regarding the methodology and specific findings. It should include essential characteristics of the study area, such as climate, geomorphology, and vegetation types. Additionally, expanding the methodology section to outline sampling techniques and data analysis methods, along with summarizing key results quantitatively, would enhance clarity and reinforce the abstract's overall impact. Including a brief discussion of the ecological implications of the findings would further elevate its relevance.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>- The manuscript is generally well-organized, with clearly defined subsections that guide the reader through the introduction, study area, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure facilitates comprehension and ensures a logical flow of information. The inclusion of tables to present data is also appropriate, enhancing overall 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 is plagued by numerous deficiencies and is not suitable for publication at this time. It lacks scientific rigor, as it does not employ established classification systems or appropriate methods for data collection and analysis. The representation of different life forms is inadequate, and the discussion fails to connect findings to broader ecological theories, suggesting a limited understanding of plant adaptations in arid climates. Overall, the research lacks technical soundness 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 exhibit significant deficiencies. While they provide a foundational understanding of plant life forms and ecological analyses, most references are outdated, with only a few recent studies cited. Observations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diversity of References: The references span various relevant topics, including classifications of life forms and ecological analyses, which aids in contextualizing the research. - Age of References: Many key references date back several decades (e.g., Humboldt 1886, Raunkiaer 1934, and Meher-Homji 1964). While these are foundational, incorporating more contemporary studies would enhance the manuscript's relevance to current research trends. - Methodological References: It would be beneficial to cite studies that outline methodologies for assessing biological spectra or ecological evaluations, which could further substantiate the methods utilized in this research. <p>In summary, while the references provide a foundational context, adding more recent studies and regional works would enrich the manuscript and enhance its relevance to contemporary research in plant ecology and biodiversity.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor 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 generally adequate for scholarly communication; however, it contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could impede clarity and readability. Addressing these issues through careful editing would enhance the manuscript's professionalism. With revisions, it could more effectively meet academic standards.</p>	
	<p>Additional observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The "Study Area" section requires more detail, including aspects like climate, temperature, humidity, precipitation, soil texture and structure, and existing vegetation formations with dominant species. - In Figure 1, titled "Bassi Wildlife Sanctuary Map," the clarity is lacking, and essential information is missing. - The "Materials and Methods" section is vague and should incorporate more comprehensive details about the methods employed. - The results section is inadequate, as it lacks substantive results and does not include histograms or tables to facilitate understanding of the findings. - The discussion is limited and does not include scientific results or comparative analyses. - The conclusion is insufficient; it needs to be more comprehensive, particularly in highlighting key findings and offering future perspectives and recommendations. <p>Decision on the article: The manuscript does not warrant publication at this time due to its numerous shortcomings. I express significant reservations regarding this article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Salemkour Nora</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>CRSTRA, Algeria</p>