

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJEE_113388 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Exploring the Responses of Teak and Eucalyptus to Elevated Carbon Dioxide in a Changing Atmosphere |
| Type of the Article | Review Article |

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>1. Yes, it's an article that tackles a useful topic for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the proposed article is closely related to the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the proposed article is not understandable. The proposed abstract lacks coherence in terms of the study objective, the methodology used and the key results obtained. The abstract should be revised. The proposed keywords are to be reviewed. It is strongly recommended to avoid groups words.</p> <p>4. The document needs to be reorganized, with each sub-section clearly identified.</p> <p>5. After correction the article will be scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>6. The bibliographic reference is not well supplied. For a literature review, there are zero recent articles out of the 47 used. The most recent article used was published in 2011. Whereas we are in 2024. The gap is too wide. This part needs to be reviewed before the article is accepted.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Acceptable | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | There is a total absence of graphs and statistical data in the manuscript. Graphs and statistical data better illustrate the results of scientific research. I strongly recommend that the authors insert graphs to better explain certain figures. | |

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) | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name: | Bouraima Safiou |
| Department, University & Country | Université d'Abomey, Bénin |