

Review Form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_IJECC_105464
Manuscript title:	Effect of seed test temperature on Bhendi seed germination
Item Type	Original Research Article

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the 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 comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p><u>Mandatory</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the 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 any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals: The keywords must be worked with the UNESCO THESAURI, which is a universal glossary that places the research topic within a specific spectrum of sciences: Agriculture - Crop - Ambient temperature...</p> <p>This section (introduction) should include data on the problem found in the summary. As for the basic method mentioned, it should be included in the methodology. The justification that is intended to give the problem is very weak. It would be important to reference the study with authors or papers that exist on this topic.</p> <p>The research context is appropriate; the experimental design by plots is pertinent; the selection of the times to apply the temperature processes in the seeds are viable as well as the formula used to read the results.</p> <p>It should be indicated whether or not there are studies on the subject, in this its originality is specified. The results are compared with similar studies, indicating that there are studies on this topic. In addition, the new findings are clear and relevant, so much so that the results of Blazich et al. (1995). That is to say, the bhendi seed could produce vigorous seedlings at high temperatures. It would be important to indicate future lines of research that can be based on this study.</p> <p>In the absence of the objective of the investigation, the conclusions cannot be assessed.</p> <p>2. The topic is relevant. However, as there are studies on the subject, it loses its originality. Unless the originality is established by the place where the research was carried out.</p> <p>3. It is important that the objective of the investigation is mentioned. The methodology and results are pertinent. In this section, the conclusions of the study should be included.</p> <p>4. The structure is appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript contains some inconsistencies in the development of some sections that do not allow us to establish that this study is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are too weak for a very serious study. It is suggested that at least they should be between 30 - 50. Taking into consideration, that the references support the justification of the problem as well as the new findings and the research methods applied.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Appropriate</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The study presents interesting results as a contribution to the agricultural system. Field work - laboratory is noted. However, in the structure of the article it has weaknesses that are mentioned in this report. If you wish to publish, it is suggested to take into account the given recommendations.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador