

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124821
Title of the Manuscript:	Geo-Hydro-Biology through GIS vs. Naturopathy, Gandhmardan Hills, India
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article is scientifically sound. In my view, the authors put too many objectives in the same article which makes the reader confuse. Hence it is better to focus on a particular one or two objectives.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The authors advised to rewrite the title suitable for the content of the manuscript.	
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 of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All the subsections are properly organized in the manuscript. However, there are many objectives are included in the article. For example: Bio-Geo-Chemistry of Gandhamardan Hills Water and soil samples through X-ray fluorescence spectrometer; Land use and land cover Harishankar Ethnobotany	
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.	The manuscript is lacking of focused oriented methods and results. Some time it describes about the soil elements, Land use and land cover, climate hazards, generation of maps, ethno botanical values of grasses etc. In the introductory chapter, the article highlights use of plant in Ayurveda and Unani. However, while mention the uses in the Table-2, there is lack of information either uses are in Ayurveda or Unani. The authors neglected to mention the scientific way plant names. For example, sometimes the author name L. is mentioned as Linn.; <i>Celastrus paniculatus</i> Willd. mentioned as <i>Celastrus paniculatus</i> (W) <i>Dendrophthoe falcata</i> (L.f.) Ettingsh. mentioned as <i>Dendrophthoe falcata</i> (Linn. f.) <i>Saraca asoca</i> (Roxb.) Willd. mentioned as <i>Saraca asoca</i> (R..)de Wilde	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references quoted in the manuscript are updated and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the manuscript it suitable for scientific communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No plagiarism suspected in the article. There is competing interest issues with the current manuscript. There are no ethical issues associated with present work and the manuscript.	

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:	V. Rama Rao
Department, University & Country	Central Ayurveda Research Institute, India