



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_31855
Title of the Manuscript:	PLANT GENETIC RESOURCES (PGR) IN NIGERIA AND THE REALITY OF CLIMATE CHANGE - A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Minireview paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- For a review paper of 27 pages, there were surprisingly few references. Many sections had large components with no citations whatsoever. - For having a focus on plant genetic resource, a large section of the paper was dedicated to other areas, including anthropogenic impacts of climate change. I would like to see a slightly more focused paper. Given the low reference count and the lack of focus on PGR.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Definition of PGR could be expanded upon. - Line 66 – should read mid-1900s - Line 83-85 awkward, please reword - Line 105- reword - Line 141 - Why are you citing the BBC without citing anything? There are very few references in this section. - Table 2 – Delta has 'Half of the population' affected and Bayelsa has '2/3 of the population' What were the exact values? - Line 298 – Injured people are 'treated' not 'cured' - Figure 2 is missing colours for the legend - Line 419 0 missing words - Line 432 – remove comma - Line 616 – PGR was already defined, do not include 'plant genetic resources' just state PGR, continue this throughout. - Line 701-702 – rewrite	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are missing spaces and slightly awkwardly written segments throughout. A very careful revision is required.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David O'Connor
Department, University & Country	Redpath Museum, Department of Biology, McGill University, Canada