

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105177
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Drying Media on Different Cut Flower.
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>)

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>1. Partly it can be, but no recent literature and methods are available in the proposal.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is, But it should be corrected as 'Flowers'.</p> <p>3. More data and detail could be given.</p> <p>4. They are.</p> <p>5. The results were evaluated statistically, but no Duncan test was done, so no lettering in the tables and graphs make it difficult to understand the differences.</p> <p>6. References part is very insufficient. It should be supported by recent literature.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The quality is not bad but there is confusion in the chronological presentation of the research.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. There is no material part in the manuscript. The source of plant material should be written (from the greenhouse or from the field, when they collected/picked, the harvest time, and how much fresh plant material, and flowers were used at the beginning (g)? The fresh material used at the beginning should be the same, so we can observe the differences. This part is not clear.</p> <p>2. A lettering should be done, especially in the graphs.</p> <p>3. The methods used to determine the quality characteristics are very old and almost all are phonologic. There are many recent quality-defining methods using GC and Spectro.</p> <p>4. The contribution of this manuscript in this form to science is very limited.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reyhan Bahtiyarca Bağdat
Department, University & Country	Central Research Institute of Field Crops, Türkiye