



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_30791
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical changes in leaves of important trees exposed to pollution and exhausts at roadsides of Jabalpur, India
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 '**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The MS seems to be a complete B.Sc or M.Sc project of the author. The author should reduce the work to a reasonable size. The title of the work is ambiguous. Biochemical changes in leaves of important trees exposed to pollution and exhausts at roadsides of Jabalpur, India. The question are . Why are these plants more important than other plants. li. What is the difference between pollution and exhaust. Why so specific on exhaust. The suggested title is “ Biochemical changes in leaves of selected trees exposed to vehicular pollution at roadsides of Jabalpur, India”. 1.the abstract does not give the main result of the work with specific data 2The introduction is voluminous 3. The materials and methods section is a copy and paste from a textbook for chemical analysis. The author suppose to present what and how he carried out the experiment in a concise form and not to copy procedures directly from textbooks 4. The result section contains only charts and Tables with no explanation of any. 5. The discussion is more or less like result and does not have any citation to back up the result. 6. The references are inadequate for this kind of study 7. No evidence of statistical analysis in the results 8. There are so many grammatical errors in the work	All the points mentioned by the reviewer were taken care of as far as possible. The title was revised as advised. The question why the plants are more important was addressed in text. Material and Methods portion was reduced with proper back-up reference. The author is not in a position to revise the result portion at the moment. Discussion portion was revised. Reference portion was enriched. Grammatical errors were rectified as indicated in the PDF.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		