

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_87840
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF HEIGHT EQUATIONS FOR TEAK (Tectona grandis L.f.) PLANTATION IN KETOU COMMUNE, KETOU, REPUBLIC OF BENIN
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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy> )

### 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)												
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments														
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<table><tr><td>Introduction:</td><td>In this section, the importance of the study has been clearly described. Also, convenient literatures have been specified.</td></tr><tr><td>Methodology:</td><td>An effective methodology has been used and clarified adequately.</td></tr><tr><td>Results:</td><td>In the result section, an effective way has been used.</td></tr><tr><td>Discussion:</td><td>In this section together with Results, the findings have been correlated with the literature, effectively.</td></tr><tr><td>Bibliography/References:</td><td>There is no problem in Reference section.</td></tr><tr><td>Decision:</td><td>There are some small writing mistakes. The manuscript should be re-read by the author, correct these mistakes. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor corrections.</td></tr></table>	Introduction:	In this section, the importance of the study has been clearly described. Also, convenient literatures have been specified.	Methodology:	An effective methodology has been used and clarified adequately.	Results:	In the result section, an effective way has been used.	Discussion:	In this section together with Results, the findings have been correlated with the literature, effectively.	Bibliography/References:	There is no problem in Reference section.	Decision:	There are some small writing mistakes. The manuscript should be re-read by the author, correct these mistakes. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor corrections.	
Introduction:	In this section, the importance of the study has been clearly described. Also, convenient literatures have been specified.													
Methodology:	An effective methodology has been used and clarified adequately.													
Results:	In the result section, an effective way has been used.													
Discussion:	In this section together with Results, the findings have been correlated with the literature, effectively.													
Bibliography/References:	There is no problem in Reference section.													
Decision:	There are some small writing mistakes. The manuscript should be re-read by the author, correct these mistakes. Manuscript can be accepted for publication after minor corrections.													
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	As a general evaluation, manuscript contain valuable results and findings for plant sciences studies in the future.													

### 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 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Nuri ÖNER
Department, University & Country	Çankırı Karatekin University, Turkey