

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJECC_109536   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of split application of nitrogen levels in summer pearl millet ( <i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.) |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is contributed some important data about N application with the recommended dose of phosphorus for the scientific community</li> <li>2. The title of the article is suitable</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article adequately covers the content of the study</li> <li>4. Subsections and structure of the article are appropriate to the extent required by the abstract of the article.</li> <li>5. I believe that the experimental process of the article is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The references used in this article are sufficient and up to date.</li> </ol> |   |
| <p><b>Major</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication</li> </ol>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | I believe that a major revision is necessary for this article.  |   |

### 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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Mustafa Kemal Altunođlu</b>    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Kafkas University, Türkiye</b> |