

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99041
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of pulsing and holding solutions on vase life of Melaleuca bracteata foliage
Type of the Article	RESEARCH WORK

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)	YES, it is important however there is a tremendous lack of information in the abstract : there are no clear objectives, it is not clear what are 'modules' in line 3. Why were used those solutions ... Yes No Yes Correct yes but incomplete. No, the most recently one is from 2017 The introduction is very incomplete. It should be mentioned the problematic that the authors are studying and the objectives of the research	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Should be improved.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Elisa Rato
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Évora, Portugal