Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_101397**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Correlation and Regression Studies of Growth, Yield Attributes, Yield and Nutrient uptake of foxtail millet under Different Varieties and Landraces**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. Yes the manuscript is important for the scietific community. The dependence of grain production and their quality on the amount (relative to that contained in the soil) of administered nutrients, on the type of grain (here mille), is important for cultivation strategies in the future. If the research were to be extended for 10-20 years, then the value of the results would become enormous for the planning of cultivation variants on possible rotation intervals. It is good that, for now, the experiment is repeated and the eventual variation of the regression coefficients and correlations with time is observed. These variations could give information related to the structural changes of the soil, the climate changes, the possible changes of the cereal varieties as a result of the way of cultivation.** **2. Yes the title of the article is suitable.** **3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive, but some sentences are too short and reproduce only fragments of the work. They can be reformulated and slightly modified (see the reviewed manuscript attached to the review).** **4. Yes the structure and the subsections of the manuscript are appropiate.** **5. In my opinion, the manuscript is scientifically correct, with some small exceptions noted in the peer-reviewed manuscript attached to the review.** **6. The references chosen by the authors are recently published, but they are few. A few articles should be added, not so much for the scientific content, as for the way of presentation that I insist on, that is, the introduction of some evidence of the experiments: photos, maps, schemes of the experimental plots, photos of the plants in various important stages of the experiment. In this sense, I suggest the works below, as an example ([1,2,3]).** **References** **1. Mallareddy M., SCREENING OF FOXTAIL MILLET (Setaria italica L.) GENOTYPES AT DIFFERENT SOWING DATES FOR HIGHER RETURNS IN NORTHERN TRANSITION ZONE OF TELANGANA.** 2019 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349588551_SCREENING_OF_FOXTAIL_MILLET_Setaria_itali	

	ca_L_GENOTYPES_AT_DIFFERENT_SOWING_DATES_FOR_HIGHER_RETURNS_IN_NORTHERN _TRANSITION_ZONE_OF_TELANGANA **2. Ramesh P, Juturu VN, Yugandhar P, Pedersen S, Hemasundar A, Yolcu S, Chandra Obul Reddy P, Chandra Mohan Reddy CV, Veerabramha Chari P, Mohan R and Chandra Sekhar A (2023) Molecular genetics and phenotypic assessment of foxtail millet (*Setaria italica* (L.) P. Beauv.) landraces revealed remarkable variability of morpho-physiological, yield, and yield-related traits. *Front. Genet.* 14:1052575. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2023.1052575** https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fgene.2023.1052575/full **3.Tirthankar Bandyopadhyay**, **StéphanieM Swarbreck**, **Vandana Jaiswal**, **Rajeev Gupta**, **AlisonR. B entley**, **Howard Griffiths**, **Manoj Prasad ,** Grain number and genotype drive nitrogen-dependent yield response in the C4 model ***Setaria italica* (**L.) P. Beauv (**bioRxiv 2020.03.23.003004; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.23.003004**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments	The reasons why I opted for the **major revision** are: - corrections in Table 2; - a control of the explanation of all abbreviations used in the manuscript; - the manuscript requires a check of the grammar of the text, in the English version indicated by the publisher (UK, US, or India, or another accepted version); - although not mandatory for publication, for credibility and repeatability, we recommend maps, experimental schemes, and photos of the experimental activity (a work without these elements cannot access grades higher than 8, in my opinion). **Consequently, I propose a major revision and after, a new review.**	

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Cardei Petru**
Department, University & Country	**The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania**