

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Biology and Nature</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBAN_12512
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SEDIMENT PROPERTIES BETWEEN NYPA FRUTICANS-DOMINATED AND RHIZOPHORA-DOMINATED FORESTS IN IKO CREEK
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript tries to highlight the soil physico-chemical difference between the native Rhizophora and the so-called invasive Nypa areas. The authors have tried to bring awareness about why Nypa dominance is detrimental to the overall ecosystem health. The authors have also tried to make recommendations for remediation. While this is important to be highlighted, the scientific analysis if the collected data and its corresponding interpretation needs to be accurate in order to make proper recommendations.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Relevant changes have been highlighted in the comments	Noted
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. The Abstract has no background information highlighting the importance and relevance of the study	Noted
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, the Introduction have unnecessary sub-section structure not appropriate for a scientific manuscript	Noted
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A	No the manuscript is not scientifically robust. The authors have tested a one-time snapshot of the area and have used the wrong statistics to analyse the data. The graphs portray no significant differences between habitats, while they have been statistically shown to be significantly different on account of the wrong statistics. Furthermore, at many places the authors have over-	Noted

minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	interpreted the differences, making conclusions not tested by the authors and not directly derived from the results	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not applicable	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, there are areas with wrong sentence construction as commented throughout the manuscript. The authors have used multiple variants of wrong spelling of their native plant	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methodology is scant in relevant details like what was the important plant species composition of the area and, how the samplings were done. In contrast there were unnecessary details about other parameters of the study site like 'evaporation rates'. Although the authours have indicated clear seasonality of rainfall in the area, they have not considered its effect on the physco-chemical parameters while comparing between area  <b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	Noted

## **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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	