

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_110236</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Enhancing Growth, Seed and oil Yield of Rainfed Castor through the Application of Nano Urea</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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 summary section is the part that briefly describes the manuscript. In this manuscript, the abstract does not include the integrity of the article.</p> <p>2. The introduction of the manuscript is very weak, there is not enough literature research on Castor Oil, Urea, and Rainfed Castor. Additionally, the originality of the manuscript is not disputed in the introduction.</p> <p>3. There is no figure or visual in the manuscript to support the experimental results in Results and Discussion.</p> <p>4. The originality of this subject should be discussed by evaluating previous studies on this subject in the literature in Results and Discussion.</p> <p>5. Since the tables in which the results are given are not supported by the literature, it is controversial whether the experimental results are qualified or not.</p> <p>6. References in the manuscript are very inadequate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No, there are grammatical errors in the language of the article.	
<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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Omer Faruk Er
Department, University & Country	Rare Earth Elements and Critical Minerals Research Institute, Turkey