



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_46963
Title of the Manuscript:	The riparian tree species composition and diversity of the midstream of Halda river in Chittagong, Bangladesh
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Grammar generally poor</b> – paper must be professionally proofread before a next submission</li> <li>2. <b>Abstract</b> – Methodology need to be presented before results</li> <li>3. <b>Abstract</b> – should start with the problem statement sentence.</li> <li>4. <b>Introduction</b> – significant duplication need to be removed – refer to accompanied revised manuscript.</li> <li>5. <b>Introduction</b> – indicate value of the river and the riparian zone of this river to motivate for conservation efforts proposed in the Conclusion section.</li> <li>6. <b>Introduction</b> - Remove specific objectives – relocate to methodology section and add specific methodology to them</li> <li>7. <b>Introduction</b> – relocate description of river to methodology – study area description.</li> <li>8. <b>Discussion</b> section absent! This is a FULL paper, which should have a separate Discussion section, in which ALL results are discussed under the same headings as used in the results section.</li> <li>9. <b>Conclusion</b> - should present insight, gaps in study and way forward</li> <li>10. <b>References</b> - not in accordance to journal guidelines.</li> <li>11. <b>References</b> - The use of 2 or more references to validate only one fact should be strongly discouraged. Correct throughout the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Additional issues are indicated in the accompanied reviewed manuscript.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Insert space between numerical and SI unit – Correct throughout the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	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



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

		<i>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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Martin Potgieter</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Limpopo, South Africa</i></b>