



|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Name:                    | <a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_UPJOZ_3322</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Diversity of Psammophytes in Sand Dunes of Periyakadu Coast, southwest Coast of India</b> |
| 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                    |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments<br><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | <p>Yes, little is known about coastal dune vegetations in India</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Ok</p> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  | --The Table 1 is the constitutes a core of this paper. I suggest to insert another column to show                          |                                      |



|                          |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
|                          | <p>conservation status of these plants based on the local Red Data List or whatever. Perhaps most plants are not in it. In that case few sentences should be added in the text about conservation status of these species. I also feels that it would be useful to show in the table economic importance of these species (which of the plants are medical, which are a food for people etc.)</p> <p>--The use of upper case in the text is not always correct (for example: species should not be written with capital letter).</p> <p>--The family name Compositae should be replaced with Asteraceae, as family names should be derived from species (genus) names.</p> |  |
| <b>Optional</b> comments | The figure showing the study area is somehow distorted (elongated). The proportions (length, width) should remain the same.  |  |

## **PART 2:**

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