

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126044
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Fruit, Seed traits and Seedling growth performance of different Seed sources of Calophyllum inophyllum
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is written in a simple and readily comprehensible manner. The introduction is fairly broad in terms of the botany of <i>Calophyllum inophyllum</i> , but the remainder of the text focuses narrowly on representative regional seed viability, germination and growth attributes. Some regional variations are suggested, but the significance of these numerical differences are not made clear, in that statistical assessment in the manuscript is minimal. The net impact of the work is thus unclear at this point.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is a reasonable overview, but it asserts conclusions for which there is no clear statistical validation.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Manuscript structuring is fine.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is unpublishable in current form, due to the reporting of means and implicit differences without any accompanying statistical quantitation. Ironically, the Methods section does list some statistical analysis that was theoretically performed, but these actual calculations and results appear nowhere in the manuscript. Tables 2-5 report simple means without any error margins. There is no basis for asserting that any mean therein is larger or smaller than any other mean.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References appear adequate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Writing is fine; few or no spelling, grammatical or compositional errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is not publishable in current form, due to the absence of any statistical objectivity. Presumably, this omission can be corrected. At this point, it may be possible to assess the conclusions.	

Review Form 3

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:	Gerald H. Lushington
Department, University & Country	USA