Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_109873**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The influence of dwarfing interstock on biometric growth parameters of apple**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The importance of clonal interstems have been proof all over the years in many different crops, although this work is very poor in terms of methodology and it is not clear in terms of results. The authors said "The results showed that increased interstem length significantly decreased sapling height and growth but was non-significant in days taken to sprouting and survival per cent." How can they proof that the length increase is related to the used technique and not with other factors. Have the temperature and humidity, for example, been monitorized? They also said in results and discussion that "interstock length significantly affected growth parameters…", "The interstock length of 8 inches significantly decreased…". Where are the statistical analyses to show the significance of the results? 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is too long and repetitive. It doesn´t show in a clear way the aim of the work. The results are not clear either. 4. The structure is ok, although it needs some images and tables. 5. I think there are not big scientific mistakes, but the article is very poor and superficial. 6. There is a deficiency in the number of bibliographic references. They are also mostly very old studies.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The quality of the English is not bad, it needs minor corrections. There are some spacing lapses.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the article is not badly written but needs to explore more deeply all the subjects and for sure images and statistical analyses are essential.	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Lisete Fernandes**
Department, University & Country	**Trás-os-Montes a Alto Douro University, Portugal**