

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88677
Title of the Manuscript:	PHENOLOGY OF PLANT SPECIES FOUND IN UGWUEME HYDROCARBON SEEP SITE, ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lac k of N o velt y', 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.6

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

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The language must be reviewed, there are written words, for example "favourable", that are incorrect.</li> <li>"In Nigeria, the Southern and Northern Guinea savanna zones have very well marked seasonal periodicity in the appearance of vegetation. In the dry season, between January and April, after the vegetation has been burnt and when the rainy season is about to begin, the trees generally produce new leaves and flowers". <b>There is no reference for this text, in the introduction section.</b></li> <li><b>Grammar and punctuation need to be revised. There are passages, for example in the methodology, where the space indication is being made with the symbol next to the number.</b></li> <li><b>A figure 5 is mentioned but is not included in the document.</b></li> <li><b>Figure 1 was formatted in the way where it is not possible to check the geographic co-ordinates, in addition there are acronyms in the legend without description. I recommend adjustments for a better interpretation.</b></li> <li><b>In table 2, does the number of species refer to the sum of three years for that month? It is not clear.</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The references used are very old, I recommend updating.</li> <li>It is not clear how the characterization of the species that are assisted in the study was carried out. There is no deposit number for herbarium confirmation.</li> <li>It is not clear how many exemplars of each one species were analysed.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design of the experiment is not clear enough to be reproducible by other authors, after all it was an annual follow-up study, and it is not described properly how the space and quantity of species were calculated. How many days in each month were observed for obtaining the data?</li> <li>In the conclusion, presented at the end of the results and discussion, it is said that the work is the basis for phenological demonstration of different plants and serves as guide for planning their use in specific soils. However, I believe that the most valuable conclusion is about phenological changes and adaptation to a contaminated land. There was a lack of discussion to support the comparison of the phenological behaviour of these species in regions with similar climate conditions but do not have this soil restriction.</li> </ul>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ohana Luiza Santos de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	University Center Maria Milza, Brazil