

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104798
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic manures and potassium levels on growth and yield attributes of Pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.)
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Effect of organic manures and potassium levels on growth and yield attributes of Pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is important for scientific community in the sense that it tackles the effects of organic manures and potassium levels on growth and yield attributes of Pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.) which has a direct impact on the production of food resource. The title is suitable. The abstract of the article was not comprehensive. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. Yes, it is scientifically correct in a way that the experiment done were based on science. The references are not sufficient enough <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For the introduction, the way it was written was very simple that resulted in a lack of substance. The introduction requires, major revision since the main topic was not discussed and/or not fully explained. For the materials and methods, many vital parts of this part of the manuscript were missing. The locale, data analysis, instrument and where the procedure was based on were missing. Again, the result will not be valid, unless this part were established. For the result and discussion, all the results were presented and analysed. However, the manner or approach on how it was computed and obtained were questionable since the methodology part were not fully stated. The result was written comprehensively. All the data needed were explained very well and necessary supporting statements were included. The conclusion was short but comprehensive. However, because of the status of the data obtained, the said conclusion is still afloat. Add more reference by inserting it in the introduction and result. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General 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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jomell M. Santiago
Department, University & Country	Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines