

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_92465</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimizing the time of grafting in Jackfruit in subtropical environment of Assam</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p>1) The article is marked by the authors as an Original Research Article. The publishing house's requirements for articles in this category are that the article has 3000-6000 words. Your article is under 2000 words, so it should be enriched.</p> <p>2) Modern articles containing the description of the experimental activity associated with the research carried out contain, most of the time, images of the various stages of the experimental activity. Without such images, the experimental activity or its quality leads to the suspicion of some lack or errors. The experiments must be able to be reproduced by other researchers.</p> <p>Then we recommend to enrich the article, we recommend the authors to insert photos containing:</p> <p>2.1) the plantation on which the experiments were carried out (if possible, at different times, i.e. a photo from March, one from April, etc., possibly also photos of the same grafted plant, at different times of development);</p> <p>2.2) Photos showing the method of grafting (pin);</p> <p>2.3) photos of the final stage of development for each plant variant (T1...T7), possibly so that the reader can compare the quality.</p> <p>3) For the enrichment of the article, we recommend the authors to introduce a classic map or GIS to locate the areas where the experiments were done on the territory of India and details of the area if possible (see Fig. R1, attached by the reviewer at the end of the reviewed manuscript).</p> <p>See for example Acedo A. L., Jr., Jackfruit, Production, Use, and Philippine Research Monograph Number 1, Forestry/Fuelwood Research and Development (F/FRED) Project, 1992</p> <p>4) The problem of theoretical-experimental optimization is inadequately explained. Any optimization problem has three main components: - the optimization parameters or variables (in this case: the treatments, the temperature, total rainfall) -the objective functions, which must be minimized or maximized (in this case: Days required for bud sprouting after grafting, Number of buds sprouting at 90 DAG, Scion length (cm) at 90 days after bud sprouting, % of Success at 90 DAG) -restrictions, which in this case consist of limiting the grafting of plants to the March-September interval, which also results in temperature and rainfall limitations (restrictions). These elements must be well specified in the text of the article.</p> <p>Because the article is valuable (if the data are real and the authors must prove it through the suggested photos or data archived in database archives), I made some proposals at the end of the manuscript consisting of graphic representations and comments to simplify the discussions and propose optimization variants based on quantified elements (the values of the objective functions or some of their combinations).</p> <p>Calculate and comment on the correlations between the optimization parameters and, eventually, you can also calculate the regressions. I am also sending a word file that the author can use as inspiration and that facilitates obtaining results that substantially enrich the content of the article.</p> <p>5) The references are few, a few more would be needed. If the authors do not find, it should be specified that the literature for this problem is poor and quite old, I have marked some references on the manuscript that are not cited in the text.</p> <p>6) It is also recommended to check the language with the control program of the text editor (Word) or with another program (eg Grammarly free or others).</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend the publication of this article, but only after the major revision, i.e. the problems reported in the Compulsory REVISION comments chapter.	

**PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cardei Petru</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The National Institute of Research, Romania</b>