



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
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=sd-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the author has indicated to have used systematic sampling methods (see section 2.2 – sampling methods), there is no indication on the population size from where the samples were drawn. This should be corrected. The procedure in research (where sampling is used) is that the study population must first be determined, therefore forming the basis for drawing samples. In other words, what was your study population? The author should address issues on validity and reliability of results obtained. Avoid using non-academic words such as, "i.e.", instead, write in full. Consider using words such as, "for example" or "for instance" Data analysis should be objective driven. For example, although the first objective was, "To prepare a tree species database of the midstream of Halda riparian area", its corresponding analysis in section 3.1 is captioned as, "Trees species composition". There is no objective evidence that the two aspects refer to the same issue. The same applies to the third objective, "To determine the relative frequency, relative density, abundance, relative dominance and importance value index of each tree species in order to characterize the structure of the vegetation", where the corresponding analysis (see section 3.3) reads as, "Importance Value Index (IVI) of Riparian Halda tree species". A similar problem occurs with the fourth objective. Analysis should clearly be informed by objectives. The third objective, "To determine the relative frequency, relative density, abundance, relative dominance and importance value index of each tree species in order to characterize the structure of the vegetation", is too long/ambiguous as it seems to address five different aspects/ variables. The author should consider revising the objective to make it specific as the case of the first objective. A good objective should always be specific as it addresses one specific issue/variable at a time. Under section 3.1, although Tables 1 and 2 are cited, they have not been presented in the document. The same applies to Table 3 (section 3.2) which is equally missing in the entire manuscript. A further problem has been noted as regards Tables 4, 5 and 6. You cannot make reference to Tables or figures which do not appear in the manuscript. This should be corrected. All Figures should appear where they are first mentioned and not at the end of the manuscript. For example, Figure 1 that is mentioned in section 2.2 should have appeared under this section and not at the end of the manuscript since it is neither part of appendix or endnotes. This should be corrected in the entire manuscript. Under references, there seems to be two different publications within the same year, by the same authors: Bhuyan, M., & Bakar, M. (2017). If this is the case, then the two should be respectively cited as, Bhuyan & Bakar (2017a) and Bhuyan & Bakar (2017b) in text. The same style should be reflected under references section. Under references concerning the authors - Hitzhusen, et al. (2007), all their surnames should be indicated. Avoid using <i>et al.</i>, in references Bikash Dey, A. (2017, February 4) although listed in references has not been cited in the main text. For consistency, ensure that all citations in the main text are listed in the references and vice versa. Be consistent in formatting of reference list. Based on the study findings and conclusion, the author (s) should suggest policy recommendations towards addressing the research problems. This should prominently feature in the main text. A notable weakness of the study is that although recommendations are provided for in the abstract, the same is missing in the main text. The abstract should hence summarise what has been reported in the paper 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author (s) should edit the entire manuscript to improve on grammar/flow. For example, the paragraph. ... "Any country's economy and 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>development are greatly dependent on the productions and service that provide a river such as fresh water supply, fish production, transportation, waste assimilation etc., along with provision of a wide array of recreation and tourism options”, is not grammatically correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Introduction section, as a standard practice, the specific objectives listed should not be bulleted, by numbered, for example “a, b,c....”, or :i, ii, ii.....” 	
Optional/General 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 feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilfred Ochieng Omollo
Department, University & Country	Kisii University, Kenya