

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_108458</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Correlation Studies for Morphological and Biomass Traits in Half-Sib Progenies of Peltoforum pterocarpum</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>I suggest the authors to include more cites of researchers in the field related to sales and marketing policies worldwide and comparing that research with their discussion performed in their study. I strongly recommend the review of different literature scientific research. Moreover, I think the authors must expand their introduction, discussion, and conclusion sections accordingly with new literature review that might strengthen their investigation.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes, although I suggest the authors to cite more articles to strengthen their findings.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	None. I think the manuscript is well written and has not typo or redaction errors.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	I suggest the authors cite more articles (they only cited four articles) related with the methodology they performed; and latter get a better understanding of the conclusions they found in their manuscript, discussing them with more details	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jorge Octavio Virues Delgadillo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Veracruzana, México</b>