

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106217
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of <i>Tabernaemontana</i> Accessions for Loose Flower Production
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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript scientifically important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specify the full name of the species in the title. - Another proposed title: "Evaluation of <i>Tabernaemontana divaricata</i> accessions for Loose Flower Production" - Clearly present the problem in the summary. <p>Yes.</p> <p>The manuscript will be scientifically sound after incorporating reviewers' comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In total, 07 scientific references were cited and of which 05 references were published between 2008 and 2017 - The author must specify the date of the 6th reference cited. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction is very poor in references. - This paucity of citation of authors shows that the author of this study has not done enough scientific research. - The problem of this study is not clearly specified. - What is the problem that arises with this plant for this study to be done. - Clearly specify in the introduction the objective of this study. <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results obtained must be carefully discussed. - The size of the "Results and Discussions" part written shows that the author has not carried out much research on the work already carried out by other authors. - You must always cite the number of tables or figures in texts or comments before displaying them immediately afterwards. <p>CONCLUSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion figure must be deleted. - In the conclusion, it is simply necessary to summarize the results obtained and specify whether the desired objective is expected or not. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Koudegnan Comlan Mawussi
Department, University & Country	University of Lomé, Togo