

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_110961</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Study of Cryopreservation and Non- Cryopreservation on seeds of Dragon Fruit (<i>Hylocereus costaricensis</i>)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<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>YES, But the author needs to improve on citing authors of previous works. The presentation of the manuscript needs to be revised unless that is journal specification</b></p> <p>2. <b>NO.</b> Studies on cryopreservation and Non-cryopreservation of Dragon fruit (<i>Hylocereus costaricensis</i>) seeds</p> <p>3. <b>yes.</b> The abstract is 215 words long</p> <p>4. <b>No.</b> authors should revisit materials and method section and present it according to journal requirement</p> <p>5. <b>to some extent YES</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>I think the authors did a great job,. But presentation of the article was somehow difficult for them (point 1 above refers).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adindu Linus-Chibuezeh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>