



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_48479
Title of the Manuscript:	Flora Diversity and Distribution in Falgore Game Reserve, Kano State, Nigeria
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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"> - Replace keywords that are already in the title; - Add information on the biodiversity of flora already known to the region of the continent. Add information on Nigeria's forest reserves, is this the only one in the country? why evaluate this and not another? - Describe the reserve if it is a governmental area, whether it is preservation or conservation, if it is a degraded area and in recovery, if there are anthropic activities, describe; describe areas and activities in the environment around; - The study lacks information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When samples were taken; - How many repetitions were performed; - In what period of the year the samples were obtained; - Who identified the samples; were the samples identified in the field? Are vouchers deposited in any collection? which? - What was the statistical treatment applied? In the summary cites ANOVA and ecological indicators, but there is no detail in the methods section; For ANOVA was there a pre-test? was any post-test applied to compare at par? - Ethical aspects need to be described, for example, government authorization to access the area and develop the research ... you can not invade an area and do any scientific activity ... - - Add information on the author descriptor of each species according to the rules of botanical nomenclatures - Add a richness estimator (Ex. Chao 1) and a rarefaction test to compare the areas - Consult journal standards and review all citations; - The lack of information pointed out in the methods does not allow to adequately evaluate the veracity of the discussion. - Consult the journal's standards and adjust. In all cases! <p>- Just one reference from the last five years. Review and update.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	See comments in the text.	
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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>It is necessary to clarify the ethical aspects</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Junir Antonio Lutinski</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Unochapecó - Regional Community University Chapecó, Brazil</i>