



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_33497
Title of the Manuscript:	Pollen characterization of Rhizophora species in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript needs major revision for publication in this journal under the following lines: 1. Some sentences are in plagiarised form e.g. the first sentence of the introduction have been copied from www.vub.ac.be/mangrove/publications/Bosire2003.pdf , docsdrive.com/pdfs/academicjournals/rjf/0000/62643-62643.pdf	Sentences have been recasted
	2. The objective is not clear, why the author selected only pollen to identify one more species of mangrove in Nigeria	The aim of this aspect of the broad research is to establish taxonomic relationships among the Rhizophora species. However, research is a continuum where no one researcher can utilize all taxonomic evidences to resolving a challenge
	3. Soil and water analysis needs to be added for justification of the results.	It is part of the enlarge research. In view of the high cost to conduct soil analysis on about 364 samples, the pollen analysis had succeeded in establishing five groups from 4 distant intervals (instead of 8) from which soil analysis will be performed
	4. The methodology is not written well. e.g. 1. the methods of pollen characterization,	The Ertzman method was used. See pages 3 and 4
	2. Dendrogram construction based on similarity index (which software was used?) is not mentioned in the methods section,	PAST software. See page 12



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. No reference is cited in the method.	Included. See page 3
	4. Statistical analysis is lacking in the study?	Included. See Page 11
	5. Results need to write in full in the results section e.g. highest and lowest value with addition of significant and non-significant values.	Included. See pages 5 to 12.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		