

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98230
Title of the Manuscript:	Size, Abundance, and Shape Diversity of Black Mangrove (Avicennia Germinans) Pneumatophores in a Deforested and Sand-Filled Forest at Eagle Island, Niger Delta Nigeria
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:

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

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, this manuscript is quite interesting to the scientific community 2. The title already describes the research clearly, but the results are still not in accordance with the description of the title so it is not consistent. 3. Abstracts are generally quite appropriate, but should include the basis of the problem, objectives, results, conclusions and recommendations. 4. Authors should review the writing guidelines for the IJECC scientific writing standards. 5. The manuscript is sufficient to meet scientific principles, but needs sharpening on the analysis. 6. References in general have used the latest sources, there are references found over 10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English quality of the article is quite suitable for scholarly communications A lot of improvements have been made by the authors. However, there is still things needs clarifications. Please refer to my comments on the manuscript. 	
Optional/General comments	After author revision, no need to return to me for rechecking.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tatan Sukwika
Department, University & Country	Sahid University, Indonesia