

Journal Name:	BIONATURE
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BN_1772
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Economic Utility of Coastal Flora Growing in and around Porbandar District of Gujarat
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <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.	<p>This manuscript play a key role to provide good platform for further scientific works in the field of ethno medicine, genetic, taxonomy, Conservation, Pharmacy etc.</p> <p>This work make easy to find the interested plant specimen.</p> <p>This work is too good for future researchers regarding to marketing purposes</p>	---
<p>Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	Yes the title of the research is attractive and Good.	--
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.	Not at all. The abstract section is too weak and briefly presented. Make it clear and attractive. Add the aims of the research along with year and country name. Do slightly touch of the result of the work in abstract section.	Abstract section is revised.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	--
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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Not at all. He or she presented well. But some spelling mistakes and typographic mistakes have been detected.	Spelling mistakes and Typographic mistakes are checked and corrected.
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	Yes references are sufficient and added updated.	--

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><i>Ye language and quality of the article are suitable.</i></p>	<p>--</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. <i>Work is original and performed well.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Title is good and interesting.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Abstract. This section is weak and please follow the scientific requirements.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Add the importance of the study at end of the abstract.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Introduction section is well written. Add the introduction of the title please.</i></p> <p>6. <i>The results have been logically presented and explained in detail. Tables of the study well presented.</i></p> <p><i>Excellent discussion.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Unprecedented graphical presentation have been found.</i></p>	<p>Title background is changed to Introduction.</p>

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	