



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3322
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity of Psammophytes in Sand Dunes of Periyakadu Coast, southwest Coast of India
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>)



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Yes, it is very interesting. The study of the psammophytes in India through the identification of the species diversity of coastal sand dunes. It represents valuable resources that are essential to both the economy, biodiversity, environment and health.</p> <p>Yes, it is</p> <p>Yes, it is</p> <p>Generally, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate, but I suggest to add more details in each part of the text</p> <p>the manuscript is correct scientifically, but some points should be controlled</p> <p>the number of references is sufficient</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>Noted</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Frame of the figures are too thick	



Optional comments	<p>The paper is showing good results and contains the most elements required for completed research, but it represented as a short communication. the most part should be controlled Therefore, this work should be accepted after Serious major revision</p> <p>The paper entitled Diversity of Psammophytes in Sand Dunes of Periyakadu Coast, southwest Coast of India. The main target of this study is interpretation results of the psammophytes in Sand Dunes of Periyakadu Coast, through the identification of the species diversity of coastal sand dunes. Species are identified by using by <i>The Flora of the Gulf of Mannar Southern India</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This paper presents a new good case study in India using real data• The authors are invited to give a short description of <i>The Flora of the Gulf of Mannar Southern India</i>• The interpretation of results is though not clearly expressed, due to the lack of combination of the environmental parameters and the statistical analysis,• The authors used a set of figures and table, that must be referred after the corresponding paragraph• The figures should be revised <p>The paper requires Serious major revision before being considered for publication.</p>	



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>	