



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_45342
Title of the Manuscript:	Vegetation Composition Related to Environmental Factors along the International Highway-West Alexandria, Egypt
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>)

**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	<p>The present article is surveying an area of around 200 km along the Mediterranean coast of Egypt to study the roadside vegetation of the international Coastal Highway from Al-Ajami (Alexandria) in the east to Ras ElHekma (Marsa Matruh) in the west of study area and the article is written in a good way but there are few points to be taken into consideration</p> <p>1- Map of the 60 stands should be revised as some points are not clear and some points are located in a non-reasonable locations.</p> <p>2- Coordinates written in the materials and methods part are wrong and should be corrected in refer to the map provided</p> <p>3- Results of TWINSpan and DCA showed a clear trend that separate the 60 stands into two major groups on the map with different environmental conditions and vegetation composition. There are around 20 stands to the west of the study were separated alone in two groups (C and D) while the rest 40 stands in the east were also separated in the other group (A and B). Discussion should better clarify the changes in vegetation and environmental conditions along the study area and what kind of possible reasons (Geological, geomorphological,...etc.) may have caused these changes to exist. It is not enough to group the 60 stands without referring this grouping to the reality back and this actually may bring a better conclusion for this article.</p>	<p>1. Map of the 60 stands should be revised as some points are not clear and some points are located in a non-reasonable locations.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>2- Coordinates written in the materials and methods part are wrong and should be corrected in refer to the map provided</p> <p>Done</p> <p>3- Results of TWINSpan and DCA showed a clear trend that separate the 60 stands into two major groups on the map with different environmental conditions and vegetation composition. There are around 20 stands to the west of the study were separated alone in two groups (C and D) while the rest 40 stands in the east were also separated in the other group (A and B). Discussion should better clarify the changes in vegetation and environmental conditions along the study area and what kind of possible reasons (Geological, geomorphological,...etc.) may have caused these changes to exist. It is not enough to group the 60 stands without referring this grouping to the reality back and this actually may bring a better conclusion for this article.</p> <p>Done</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There are few minor language corrections in the pdf file attached	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight
--	--------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>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>	