

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104877
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF FOLIAR APPLICATION OF MICRONUTRIENTS ON GROWTH AND FLOWERING OF GERBERA ( <i>Gerbera jamesonii</i> ) IN NATURALLY VENTILATED POLYHOUSE UNDER PRAYAGRAJ AGRO CLIMATIC CONDITIONS
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript had relevance to the scientific community but the report did not clearly state the aim, objective(s), justification, and importance of the research investigation.</li> <li>2. The title can be better, see the manuscript for suggestion</li> <li>3. The abstract was not comprehensive. An abstract should summarize important activities and variable ranges in data that will provide possible resolutions to the statement of problem</li> <li>4. See the manuscript for suggestions on appropriate subsection in the methodology</li> <li>5. Experimental validation can be determined after effective corrections are made</li> <li>6. References were sufficient. The old Fisher and Yates, 1963 citation does not have detailed information in the reference section, moreover, this suggests that a thorough literature review was not carried out.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The quality of the English language was suitable for communication but the author(s) should avoid using such symbol @ in the report. Also, a few grammatical errors require corrections.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emoleila Itoandon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Almon Research University, India</b>