

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_106126</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prevalent variability among jackfruit genotypes: An assessment on morphological and quality characteristics</b>
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> <b>It is important to the scientific world</b>  <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> <b>The title of the article is suitable but consider rephrasing as suggested</b>  <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>The abstract is ok</b>  <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b>  <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed</li> <li>▪ The tables must clearly <b>show the statistics</b></li> <li>▪ <b>I encourage the author(s) to bring in more of their views</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Make reference of other peoples' works.</b></li> <li>▪ Check on the listed references and make sure they have been cited</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This is a important manuscript but the author(s) need to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improve on the tables to look scientific</li> </ul>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Felix Mereka Chipojola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malawi</b>