

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change                       |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJECC_105714   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of NPK on growth and flower yield of Hibiscus (Hibiscus rosa-sinensis) |
| Type of the Article      |   |

### 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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>It is important because hibiscus has commercially important crop as it is used in cosmetics, herbal teas etc. It is also an important landscape plant. The nutritional requirement is an important factor for the growth and flowering of plants.</p> <p>In title of the manuscript author uses short forms like NPK instead Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Potassium .It is advisable always to use complete words rather than abbreviations.</p> <p>In abstract, author doesn't mention the required units of the findings, like in case of plant height units are not mentioned. The sample size taken is very small. Only one plant per replication was used for the experiment which is not sufficient to support the necessary data.<br/>Moderately appropriate, as the discussion is missing under the section of "RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS".</p> <p>NO, it is not scientifically correct, because under the section of "RESULT AND DISCUSSION" author doesn't give discussion for the findings of experiment.</p> <p>Inappropriate references. The maximum number of the references are not used in the manuscript and recent.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies present in the paper. Scientifically, it doesn't support the facts of the experiment strongly. It strictly needs revision for the publication.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>  | <p>Not good enough</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Grammatical errors</p>   |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Jujhar Singh</b>              |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Mata Gujri College, India</b> |