

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110272
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical studies on evaluation of Sunflower (Helianthus annuus L.) genotypes for heat stress
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the article is important for Agricultural scientists. The manuscript is of great importance In the current scenario of climate change. Such article urgently needed by the research community specially researcher working on sunflower. It is suggested that a summary table should be added in the review article. The table should contain findings of most recent studies (last 10 years) regarding genotypes of sunflower and heat stress and all finding which discussed in this manuscript.</p> <p>2. Yes, title of the manuscript is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive but needs some improvements, it appears to be lacking the fluency which is of prime important in scientific nature. Please make the abstract fluent. Add a sentence to show the importance of heat tolerant sunflower genotypes which will assist plant breeders to improve heat stress tolerant in sunflower.</p> <p>4. Yes, the overall structure and subsection is appropriate for the article, but Heading format not followed as per requirement.</p> <p>5. yes, the facts and findings discussed in article are scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. All the citations are not according to journal style; References are also not according to the journal format. Citation and references style should be adjusted accordingly. Citation should be indicated by the reference number in brackets.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality of English used in this article is up to the mark required for the scholarly communication, however some points in this regards can be improved i.e. throughout the manuscript the author used full stop before the citations which is incorrect with respect to Punctuation rules.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some of the typo mistake are mentioned in the track tray changes which is visible to editor these are minor mistakes, these should be fixed accordingly</p>	

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muqadas Noor
Department, University & Country	University of Sargodha, Pakistan