SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_31375**
Title of the Manuscript:	**TAXONOMIC COMPENDIUM OF PLANT COMMUNITY ON SHANKARACHARYA RESERVE FOREST**
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	**1. Relook the inclusion of the word "community" in the title and elsewhere – this has ecological implications, which falls outside the study objectives and boundaries of this study.** ABSTRACT **2. Start the abstract with a problem statement for the study area – what is the problem there that prompted this investigation?** **3. Line 12: indicate how and when the survey was conducted.** **4. Line 19: include conclusion and recommendation based on the problem statement.** **5. Lines 8-11: "locally known…and Kashmir" remove these unnecessary sentences. Replace with more results.** INTRODUCTION **6. Lines 26-27 (reference 3): "A report…and Sumatra" – suggest removing this sentence as it is not relevant.** **7. Lines 34-40 relate solely to the Shankaracharya Reserve Forest, and thus constitutes a new paragraph.** **8. Lines 37/38: "…however, due to increasing loss in earlier times…" To what type of loss is referred to here?** **9. Lines 40-45 is out of place as it does not relate directly to the Shankaracharya Reserve Forest.**	The revision comments which was suggested by the reviewer had done as per reviewer comments and highlighted by yellow colour. All the correction was made line by line.

	Suggest relocating this section to after line 35 of the introduction. **10. The use of referenced numericals is wrongly employed in lines 46-49. Sentences should be reconstituted to correctly place the referenced numericals.** **11. Line 62 "The information generated from this study helped to classify this reserve…" Classify in terms of what? Should helped be …will be helping to …? Reformulate sentence.** MATERIALS AND METHODS **12. Table 1: define steep and very steep in terms of degrees** **13. Nothing is stated concerning the sampling method employed (transects/quadrats?), the time of sampling (summer vs winter), nor how the successional status was determined, or how the community organizational analysis was done, etc. etc. This section is totally incomplete!** **14. What about voucher specimens deposited at which herbarium? This is standard practice in any taxonomic investigation.** RESULTS AND INTRODUCTION **15. Lines 86-96: relocate to introduction as this reads like an introduction due to the general nature of the content provided.** **16. Figure 1 has no value as it does not present anything new that is not already indicated in the text. Suggest removal of Fig. 1.** **17. The dominance of certain families, genera and species are not adequately explain via a detailed discussion section.** **18. Lines 116-118: "The tree plantations**	

	…successional catalysts". What would be the influence of the stated harvesting and thus removal of woody species (see Introduction section) on the succession process? **19. The use of referenced numericals is wrongly employed in lines 124-132. Sentences should be reconstituted to correctly place the referenced numericals.** **20. List of species on lines 135-144: Suggest either incorporate into Table 1, or include in a newly constituted Table 2.** **21. Line 122-123 need reference** CONCLUSION **22. Lines 148-150 is a duplication of the results – suggest removal.** **23. Include insight and possible future management recommendations.** REFERENCES **24. Please conform to the guidelines of the journal** **25. Just too many inconsistencies apparent in this section.** **26. Reference 14: remove the list of specimens examined.**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Paper should be proof-read by a English proficient editor before a next submission. Just too many grammar issues to list in this paper.	
Optional/General comments	A frequency analysis of the general and species would have been most useful in getting an idea of the genera and species richness, abundance and dominance.	