

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95566
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of plant growing media and seasons for cuttings of Kusum [Schleichera oleosa (Lour.) Oken]: A major challenge
Type of the 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 (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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- Yes it can be benefit. 2 – yes 3 - yes 4 – yes it seems / the manuscript structure was standard 5 – base on my opinion author should be a major review in some part of manuscript like a abstract , introduction and discussion 6 – some reference are old and should be change (mark the red label in the references part text)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Quality of Grammar and fluency of the sentences were little weak and should be Correct and rewrite carefully. Exactly in the result and discussion section.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper needs a minor change to suitable for a scientific magazine</p> <p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>- Introduction part: The introduction part is good, but there are some editing errors that can be easily corrected by the author.</p> <p>- Material and method part: The materials and methods section is complete and good, but there are grammatical and wording problems. The sentences should be read again and the sentences should be corrected.</p> <p>-Referencing was weak.</p> <p>-Result and discussion: - The results and discussion section is good, but it must be corrected and revised due to the grammar.</p> <p>References section: References should be one by one to be in agreement with each other in text and references section at the end and written in format of scientific magazine</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farshad Habibi
Department, University & Country	Urmia Branch Islamic Azad University, Iran