

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105120</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of different sowing dates and planting distance on growth, yield and quality of China aster (Callistephus chinensis L.)</b>
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://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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript provides new agronomic ways of improving yield and quality of the plant under study</p> <p>2. The title is suitable, however some things included in the main article do not match the title. Consider revising the title (e.g issues on costs/economic....</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and provides a summary of the study</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are somehow inappropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correctly upon revising the major issues identified by the review in the main document</p> <p>6. There is need to add more references in every section of the manuscript</p> <p>The methodology needs to be improved alot. It has not described specific methods that were done to collect and analyse the data. Results need to be improved to show scientific quality of the analysis</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The quality of English is suitable	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<b>Methodology has to be improved. (See comments in the manuscript)</b>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Mussa Kamanula</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malawi</b>