

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103519
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing the Power of Symbiosis: Maximizing Physiological Growth in Melia azedarach through AM Fungi and Pre-sowing Seed Treatments
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>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly on the contribution of arbuscular fungi to the physiological mechanism of plants. The title may be revised into "The effect of presowing treatments with Glomus mosseae and GA on the leaves physiology of Melia azedarach seedling". The abstract is comprehensive The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, but I would think that the detailed of methods should be provided. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but I would suggest the author to interpret the data collected more comprehensively The references are sufficient but they should be written following the style of this journal. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	I would strongly suggest the author to check the English spelling/grammar using a grammar checker.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	I Gede Ketut Adiputra
Department, University & Country	University of Hindu Indonesia, Indonesia