

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113404
Title of the Manuscript:	TREE CANOPY ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING; PHYSIOLOGICAL AND MOLECULAR ASPECTS
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<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 it is important as it concisely describes Tree canopy engineering, its types, importance, manipulation techniques and the aspects that make it important for the environment and the population.</p> <p>The title is suitable but my subjective judgement is that it would benefit in being more concise. 'Tree canopy architecture and engineering'.</p> <p>Yes the abstract covers most parts of the paper.</p> <p>Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>Yes I do think the manuscript is scientifically correct. On this point though, it would be beneficial to include some quantitative data to showcase its importance in aspects like increasing crop yield and the additionality that engineering Tree canopies has over not employing any manipulation techniques. Questions like, "which Architectures are quantitatively better to 'train'?"</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are a few grammatical errors in the abstract and the introductory bits of the article but the language is sound and correct for a large part if the manuscript. Examples of language errors are: 'When opposed to ...' this could be replaced with 'When compared to...' In the conclusion, 'canopy can manage by using...' should be replaced with 'canopy can be managed by using'</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amos Wanene
Department, University & Country	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology, Kenya