

Editor's Comment:

Ms_AJOB_34533_v2:

1. Kindly correct the spelling of "assessment" in the title.
2. The authors are kindly asked to include the respective author citations to the scientific names of the subject species since without the proper citation the Latinized names don't hold any taxonomic validity.
3. *Leucanthemum parthenium* is actually the Homotypic synonym of the Holotype *Tanacetum parthenium* – the Homotype is useable but in the presence of the holotype in effective and valid usage (taxonomic publication), the authors should abstain from using the former.
4. There is no need for the sub categories in the abstract section. Generally the abstract should only comprise a single paragraph, preferably within 250-300 words, touching upon all the aspects of the study, from demarcation of the problem to the conclusion and providing the readers with the gist to work with prior to delving deep within the content of the manuscript. The abstract is in serious need of restructuring.
5. Line 43 – "combating afforestation" - What does it mean? Why would anyone want to combat an ameliorative action such as afforestation? I think the proper word would be deforestation and authors need to pay attention to what they are typing because those are the words readers apart from them shall read and understand accordingly and lack of conveyance of the intended message or even failure in doing so not only holds the authors accountable to the readers eyes but stamps serious question mark to the reputation of the journal that publishes such articles.
6. Why does the introduction section contain so much useless and exhaustive information on issues not in relevance to the manuscript subject and title? The description of the species provided by the authors did not put any extra weightage to their article nor has it rendered to the quality of the article to be superior. There is still a severe lack of definition of the problem and the governing hypothesis that the works were performed on. The introduction section requires a thorough refurbishment by the authors in order to make it suitable for a scientific research article.
7. Analysis of morphological traits based on a mere ten individuals is a serious fault on the design part of the work and any observation derived from that meagre sample size is of no statistical significance.
8. What were the controlled conditions maintained for the plant growth? Was there any need of it?
9. Why was Pearson's correlation used to interpret the data? Were the data sets normalized? The authors could have used Spearman's Rank correlation instead.
10. The figures are in dilapidated condition and fail to express the details they needed to. The legends should be better written since in their currents states they are just reiterating the title of the figures themselves without revealing any new detail of the datasets considered for the figures.
11. The content of the results need to be far better in terms of structural integrity since there is a general dearth in the grammar, sentence construction and ability to convey meaningful message to the readers.
12. Why haven't the authors discussed their results and findings in a well defined discussion section?
13. The table captions need to be totally changed to something more descriptive since a caption of a table actually serves as the preamble to the content of the table itself.
14. Is it standard deviation or std. Error that the authors used indicate the deviation from the mean values of the datasets? If it is the former then the authors are kindly asked to put in the std. Error value since std. Deviation values of a data set consisting of 10 items almost always returns values that are biased and erroneous.
15. The images floral parts are of inferior quality and authors shall have to adjust the size and resolution of the image to maintain consistence and uniformity.
16. The results section is exhaustive and the authors should have focused on certain attributes of the subject specimens and dealt with that within the sphere of a paragraph so that readers could have been able to better focus on them.

17. The conclusion is not bad in terms of being succinct but a better construction of the sentences would have rendered it suitable for a research manuscript.

Verdict: Considering the comments raised by the earlier reviewers as well as based on a personal assessment of the manuscript, I am sorry to inform the authors that it is not suitable to be accepted for publication in its current state. In spite of the fallacies and shortcoming having been pointed out by the earlier reviewers and the authors making necessary correction accordingly, there still exists a general lack of quality in the manuscript and the comments mentioned in this section might help the authors to remodel their work and resubmit the same. For the time being they are asked to redesign the write up and rethink the explanations and enrich the manuscript with relevant scientific facts and then resubmit that article to the journal. The manuscript in its current modified form is nowhere suitable to be published.

Editor's Details:

Prof. Tarun Kumar De
Department of Marine Science, Ballygunge Science College, University of Calcutta, West Bengal,
India