

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_98510 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of Nitrogen and Iron on Growth and Yield of Foxtail millet (<i>Setaria italica</i> L.) |
| 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://journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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) |
|---|---|---|
| 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 manuscript is trying to contribute to current issues within the Agricultural space 2. The title of the article is suitable considering several other authors have also contributed to looking at other elemental nutrients. 3. The abstract needs to be reworked as it is currently lacking cohesiveness, it also not comprehensive and does not do justice to the calibre of work expected for the topic. 4. The structure and subsections of the manuscript needs to be worked on to demonstrate a more in-depth appreciation of the concepts being discussed and relevant literature with more recent contributions need to be reviewed. 5. With more in-depth literature review the scientific correctness of the manuscript can be improved. 6. References are old and insufficient to address the topic. References older than 10 years should be dropped and more recent works cited and referenced. E.g Sun, M.-J et al, 2022: Changes in Foxtail Millet (<i>Setaria italica</i> L.) Yield, Quantity, and soil microbiome after replacing chemical fertilizers with organic fertilizers. <i>Sustainability</i> , 14. No. 24:16412 7. Manuscript author should utilize figures and diagrams to display and demonstrate growth comparisons across treatments. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Manuscript is riddled with incoherences such as far in place of par . Grammatical incoherences to be worked on seriously. | |
| Optional/General comments | 8. More in-depth analytical data required prior to drawing conclusions. | |

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) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name: | Samuel Ugim |
| Department, University & Country | University of Calabar, Nigeria |