

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_119460
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Floral Biology of Salix alba: Insights into Reproductive Dynamics, Pollen Production and Pollen Morphology in Kashmir Himalayas
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The title needs revision.</p> <p>Abstract needs refinement.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The title: the title includes the term “reproductive dynamics”, however there is only phenology, pollen and ovule number etc have been discussed, the information about the mode of pollination, pollinators and setting ration etc is missing in the article. I would suggest to rephrase the title.</p> <p>2. Abstract: Usually, the common or local names are written outside the brackets while the scientific names are written in the brackets. The scientific names should be written in full form on first appearance as Salix alba, while written in abbreviated form as S. alba after. Pay attention to this across the whole manuscript. Make the abstract more meaningful with your summarized findings and conclusion.</p> <p>3. Introduction: the introductions section needs moderate revisions;</p> <p>a. There are several small paragraphs containing 2-3 sentences. Kindly merge the related paragraphs into a single para.</p> <p>b. Update the references. Some refernces are outdated and anonymous i.e., “Introduced to Kashmir in 1927, this species has since been cultivated for various purposes, including soil conservation, fuel wood, and fodder (Anonymous, 1983).”</p> <p>c. Describe the systematics, economics etc at first, then the reproductive biology (your research objectives), and a thorough literature review.</p> <p>d. Clearly describe the research question and research objectives.</p> <p>4. M&M:</p> <p>a. describe the climatic condition of your study area, and why choose a micro-climatic area? Give explanation to it. If possible, provide the weather data of the two study years i.e., temperature, humidity, precipitation data.</p> <p>b. Define your methodology for selecting “sexually mature tree”. If you have followed any previous research, provide the reference.</p> <p>c. How did you count the pollen grain numbers? If you have used any instrument or</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>microscope etc, please provide the details. How did you analyse the ovule number?</p> <p>d. Pollen ovule ration is calculated, but there is no information about the seed setting ratio, mode of pollination, and pollinators. It is important to understand the reproductive dynamics.</p> <p>5. Results:</p> <p>a. Phenology: the male and female flower initiation is different in both years, how? In the 2023 the flowering initiation id delayed by 2 days. Why?</p> <p>b. It will be more meaningful to describe ethe phenology in days rather than dates: i.e., how many days of flowering duration.</p> <p>c. Merge the table 1 and 2 into one table.</p> <p>d. Pollen number is estimated while there is no information about the ovule number per influence/ catkin, while the pollen: ovule ratio has been calculated. Am I missing something here, or the data is really missing.</p> <p>e. Again, here should be the data for seed setting, number of seed per catkins etc, and pollinators involved.</p> <p>6. Discussion:</p> <p>a. It is stated that “The observed variability in flowering initiation, duration, and termination corresponds on floral phenology”. However, there is no variations in the flowering duration, however the flower initiation is delayed in the second year. My question here is what is your conclusion about this delay, while the flowering duration is almost the same around ~70 day in both years?</p> <p>b. Overall, the discussion needs to be improved with proper reasoning and arguments to support the research findings.</p> <p>7. Conclusion:</p> <p>a. “Over two years, significant variations were observed in flowering timing, duration, and pollen traits among individual trees”. However, there is no ANOVA and LSD to justify this point. If yoi have calculated ANOVA and LSD, then include it in the results section.</p> <p>b. Briefly describe what you have found and what would you recommend from this research. What is the benefit to the society and which research question/ problem you have solved?</p> <p>8. Figures: there are figures given at the end, but haven’t been cited in the main text.</p> <p>9. Tables: the table haven’t been cited in the maintext.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	Huazhong Agricultural University, China