

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_98072</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of boron on growth and yield of sweet corn (Zea mays L. Saccharata) varieties</b>
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes the manuscript is important for the scientific community.</b> <b>Title is suitable for the manuscript</b> <b>The abstract is mainly detailed materials and methods with some results. There is no introduction, no interpretation of results and conclusion.</b> <b>Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. But authors should indicate the statistical tool used in the data analysis. Again, is advised to separate the results from the discussion and most authors fail to discuss or poorly discuss results when the 2 are combined. For instance, authors failed to discuss the results for Crop growth rate and relative growth rate.</b> <b>Yes, manuscript is scenically correct</b> <b>Author can add more and current references to the introduction section. Statements of facts and statistics must be referenced.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. Try not using words in title as keywords if possible 2. A good abstracts must have a short introduction, methods, results obtained, the implication of the results (discussion) and then a conclusion. Author should try and restructure the abstract in this form 3. Add more current references. There more statistics or statement of facts which are not referenced in the introduction. Please check and reference them all. 4. See track changes on manuscript for more comments	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Isaac Kojo Arah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ho Technical University, Ghana</b>