

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_103144
Title of the Manuscript:	Aspects of Tree Species Phenology and Diversity for Conservation in the Chimpanzee Forest Habitat Kwano, GashakaGumti National Park, 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.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the research is need by the scientific community since it focuses on the changes on the phenological characteristics of encountered species in response to climate change.</p> <p>The title is just suitable to the research article.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. This is in particular to "Materials and Methodology". Methodology itself include the materials and methods of the research. It is suggested to use "Methodology" instead of "Materials and Methods".</p> <p>Part of the research article is not scientifically correct. The research is on phenological characteristics and observation. The data gathering and observations should have taken a longer period of time.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Though the reader can assume the purpose of the study, the author failed to clearly define the objectives of the research conducted especially at the introduction section. The author may have omitted the Objective Section of the paper.</p> <p>The author has been discussing the "checklist of species", however, the said checklist is not included in the submitted paper.</p> <p>Map presented in Figure 1 do not reflect the trails and transects of the study as stated in the title/caption.</p> <p>Some of the references are not reflected in the Reference Section. Example is the source of Map and the TRIP Limited in page 14.</p> <p>The author failed to discuss or explain the relevance or reasons why the author opted the 3-months observation. It would be significant to discuss why the author selected June, July and August as Observation months since the study is all about species phenology.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ruth C. Cordero
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture and Forestry, President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Philippines