

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102387
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Eucalyptus Clones for Growth and Yield in Southern region of Andhra Pradesh
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)
<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>Yes, the manuscript describes the growth of eucalyptus clones under extreme climate conditions.</p> <p>Yes. Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. More in-depth statistics are needed to better report the findings. There is an extreme lack of information regarding crop treatments, plots and statistical approaches that need to be improved.</p> <p>The citations are not concentrated in the article's discussion, which shows a lack of depth in the data analysis performed. It is necessary to expand the results in order to have a better citation and characterization of the observed phenomena.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is readable. I recommend a grammar check.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>More in-depth analysis and discussion is needed. The simple report of the growth is not very significant from a scientific point of view if it is not associated with a discussion of the reasons why. The test needs an approach to the genetic parameters associated with the clones, a ranking of growth, an account of survival, indices of gain by selection, other information that supports the scientific weight of the article. Little is mentioned in the manuscript about the environment and climate change, which carries the name of the journal.</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:	Rodolfo Soares de Almeida
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Viçosa, Brazil