

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_118849
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Water hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes) in Coimbatore Lakes: Insights into Density, Biomass, Carbon stock, and Nutrient Dynamics for Environmental Conservation Strategies</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is analytical based research. I believe that such scientific surveys must be encouraged to ensure the data collection and environmental evaluation on different parameters with time. Concept and rationale is acceptable</li> <li>2. Title is suitable</li> <li>3. Yes</li> <li>4. Yes</li> <li>5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manuscript should be improved scientifically. Here are some points that might be helpful for the author to improve the manuscript and MAJOR corrections are required before publication.</li> <li>• The Structure of the introduction should be reconsidered. Benefits and drawbacks of the plant are reported simultaneously. Summarize them as history, previous studies, benefits, drawbacks and then aim of study</li> <li>• Introduction should be supported by recent references. In first paragraph 7 references were used (1999 to 2008), even latest reference was also almost 15 years old.</li> <li>• Material and Methods: The biomass of <i>E. crassipes</i> was assessed using the quadrat method. (Reference is required)</li> <li>• The leaf chlorophyll content of <i>E. crassipes</i> was measured using a Chlorophyll meter ( Specifications are required)</li> <li>• Nutrient concentration (Reference and specifications of used kits are required)</li> <li>• What is meant by factor 0.58 in the formula of carbon stock?</li> <li>• Carbon stock was calculated in % but reported in abstract as kg/m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Justify the formula for carbon stock. Half of the dry weight of the tree is C. How can you consider the ash as pure Carbon? What about other elements which are present in plants?</li> <li>• Findings of the statistical analysis, one way anova and pearson are not reported in results in tabular or graphical form.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Table 3. Leaf chlorophyll content (unit required)</li> <li>• Table 6 and fig 2 are presenting same data. Duplication is not required</li> <li>• Table 7. Relationship of carbon stock and chlorophyll content. Explain the results provided in table. Table caption is not justified so as for table 8. (Table 8. Relationship of carbon stock and nutrients) carbon stocks are not mentioned in table for comparison. Elaborate it</li> <li>• Mention units in Table 6. Moreover mean values become insignificant when SD vales are</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	very high, in that case range is more appropriate as compared to mean value. 6. More recent references should be added in results and discussion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	7/10	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Amna Yousaf</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kinnaird College for Women University, Pakistan</b>