

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95856
Title of the Manuscript:	Gamma Radiations Effectiveness on Chlorophyll Spectrum and Morphological Characteristics of Pea (Pisum sativum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for 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'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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Importance: The authors aimed to study the frequency and spectrum of macro mutations along with the mutagenic effectiveness and efficiency of different doses of gamma rays in the M3 generation of peas (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.).</p> <p>2. Title: Clear to a greater extent but preferred to be more concise as follows "Ameliorations of Gamma Radiations on Chlorophyll Spectrum and Morphological Characteristics of Peas".</p> <p>3. Abstract: Improperly displayed. The authors have to provide a background on the problem of one or two short sentences before illustrating the aim. Some modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>4. Structure of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords: Clear, properly arranged, and informative. Introduction: Improperly arranged. Preferred to rearrange the introduction into three paragraphs only i.e., 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. The aim: Clear and informative. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No ethical approval number and considerations were provided. Some abbreviations have to be fully introduced. The authors did not provide the statistical analysis with a reference and the statistical model used. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Results: The results are novel and clear to a greater extent. Some modifications that were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text and some abbreviations have to be fully introduced. Discussion: Clear to some extent, informative, and contribute to knowledge with moderate comparison and speculation. Please avoid the numbering and bulleting in the text writing of any of the manuscript sections. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Conclusion: Not listed. Tables: Well-presented and organized. Figures: Well-presented and organized. <p>5. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript presents a good and sound important idea with moderate expression that requires a little bit improvement to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>References: MUST BE UPDATED as 5% (1 out of 20) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to 30-40%. The old reference indicates less interest in the study field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>General view: The manuscript was written in a moderate English and grammar. A certain degree of copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve the publishing value.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt