Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_99113**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Corm yield and economics of gladiolus cultivars affected by micronutrients grown under open field conditions in under subtropics of Jammu**
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:

(https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, particularly for researchers and practitioners in the field of vegetable science, floriculture, and micronutrient management in crops. The experiment conducted at Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Jammu evaluated the effect of micronutrients on corm yield and economics of gladiolus, a popular ornamental flower. The study utilized a randomized block design with multiple treatments and replications, and the results indicated that foliar application of ZnSO4 at 0.2% and FeSO4 at 0.2% resulted in the highest number of corms per plant, corm weight per plant, diameter of corms, yield of corms per plot, net income per hectare, and cost benefit ratio. Additionally, the combination of ZnSO4 at 0.4% and FeSO4 at 0.4% showed promising results for cormels weight per plant, number of cormels per plant, and yield of cormels per plot. These findings suggest that micronutrient management, specifically the application of ZnSO4 and FeSO4 at specific rates, can significantly impact the production and productivity of gladiolus. The manuscript's emphasis on micronutrients, gladiolus cultivation, and economic implications of the treatments makes it relevant and valuable for the scientific community working in this field. The keywords provided also indicate the manuscript's focus and can help researchers easily identify relevant literature when conducting literature searches. 2. Yes, the title of the article, "Corm yield and economics of gladiolus cultivars affected by micronutrients grown under open field conditions in subtropics of Jammu," is generally suitable as it provides a concise and descriptive overview of the main subject of the manuscript. It mentions the key aspects of the study, including corm yield, economics, gladiolus cultivars, and the influence of micronutrients, and also indicates the specific location where the experiment was conducted (i.e., subtropics of Jammu). 3. Based on the information provided, the abstract appears to provide a brief overview of the key elements of the study, including the experimental design, the crop species (Gladiolus grandiflorus L. cv. 'Nova Lux'), and the effect of different micronutrient treatments on corm yield and economics. It mentions the specific location and year of the experiment, the randomized block design with three replications and nineteen treatments, and the main results obtained with different micronutrient applications, including the maximum number of corms per plant, corm weight, diameter of corms, yield of corms per plot, net income per hectare, and cost benefit ratio. It also highlights the most effective micronutrient treatment for increasing production and productivity in gladiolus. However, the abstract could be considered more comprehensive by providing additional context, such as the methods used, statistical analysis, and implications of the findings. Additionally, it would be helpful to include the units of measurement for the results (e.g., grams, centimetres, etc.) for clarity. Overall, the abstract provides a general overview of the study's main findings but could potentially benefit from further elaboration and inclusion of additional information. 4. Overall, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate and follow a common format for scientific research articles. 5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. 6. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality of the article is generally acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are some minor issues that could be improved.	
Optional/General comments	There are a few minor revisions that I recommend to further improve the manuscript: Provide more information on the specific gladiolus cultivar used in the experiment, including its characteristics and origin. Include more details on the experimental setup, such as the number of plants per plot, spacing, and replication. Clarify the statistical analysis used and provide the exact p-values for the reported statistical significance. Discuss the limitations of the study and potential areas for future research.	

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Miguel Galv-an-Ruiz**
Department, University & Country	**Autonomous University of Queretaro, Mexico**