

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127658
Title of the Manuscript:	Species Diversity In Coastal Homegardens Of Kerala
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This article investigates the biodiversity in Kerala coastal gardens and examines regional diversity across Agro-Ecological Units (AEUs). Crop diversity is assessed using the Shannon-Weiner index, and the effects of ecological, socio-economic, and cultural factors are discussed. The study holds potential for contributing to sustainable agriculture, biodiversity conservation, and food security.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Crop Biodiversity in Kerala's Coastal Homegardens: A Study Across Agro-Ecological Units (AEUs)	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is too long and should be shortened to focus only on the most significant findings.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The use of the <b>Shannon-Weiner index</b> is a well-established and appropriate method for assessing biodiversity in ecological studies. This index effectively quantifies species diversity, making it suitable for the study's aim of analyzing crop diversity across different regions and Agro-Ecological Units (AEUs).	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The reference formatting needs correction. Some journal names are provided in full, while others are abbreviated.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract is too long and should be shortened to focus only on the most significant findings.</li> <li>2. The sub-headings "Research Problem," "Research Gap," "Objectives," and "Hypotheses" are not necessary within the journal's format. These sections can be integrated into the introduction for a more cohesive presentation.</li> <li>3. A taxonomic list of the species constituting biodiversity should be provided as an appendix.</li> <li>4. The ANOVA results for biodiversity indices between regions (P-value = 0.4345) show no statistically significant difference. However, regional diversity is emphasized in the discussion. This contradiction should be addressed.</li> <li>5. The representativeness of the sample size (n=45) should be discussed.</li> <li>6. The relationship between socio-economic factors and biodiversity is addressed superficially. The reasons for the negative impact of economic and market-driven motivations on biodiversity should be explained in more detail.</li> <li>7. Concrete policy recommendations for AEU's with low biodiversity (e.g., AEU 1) should be developed, enriching the practical implications of the study.</li> <li>8. The discussion section can be deepened. Unnecessary repetitions should be reduced, and focus should be placed on the results.</li> <li>9. Generalizations such as "Traditional knowledge is important" should be supported with concrete examples.</li> <li>10. Consistency in terminology should be maintained (e.g., "Mid region" should be "Mid-region").</li> <li>11. The reference formatting needs correction. Some journal names are provided in full, while others are abbreviated.</li> </ol> <p>The article provides valuable insights into biodiversity in Kerala coastal gardens. However, its scientific impact and contribution can be enhanced with a clearer framework, critical analysis, and contextualization. A major revision of the study is recommended.</p>	
---	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Erhan Unlu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dicle University, Turkey</b>