

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112861
Title of the Manuscript:	CANOPY MANAGEMENT OF THE GREAT BANYAN TREE IN AJC BOSE INDIAN BOTANIC GARDEN, HOWRAH
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript is important It is suitable but the abbreviation AJC should be written in full The abstract need modification such as introduction, objective of the study, method employed during the survey and analysis of the data, results of the study and conclusion/recommendations and finally, abstract should not be indented. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is ok but needs some modifications: Section 3, materials and methods was used but under it is a section for methodology (replace it with techniques), figure was used for the photographs instead of plates (replace figures with plates), two systems of citations were use i. e numbers and author's name and year of publication (choose one). Results of the study should be discuss because it too brief. Your discussion is more of literature review try and compare the result of the study with previous studies. The conclusion should not have citations. It should based on the findings of the study. The manuscript is ok but needs modifications as in 4 above The references are not sufficient for this work. There are different works online related to this one, as such, there is need to add more into the work, at least 30. Secondly, old references as highlighted in the article should be removed and replaced with the most recent ones. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language or English is ok.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article is ok for publication because the outcome of the study will be important source of information for future researchers	

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:	Ja'afar Adamu Abdul Zankan
Department, University & Country	Bayero University, Nigeria