

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100390
Title of the Manuscript:	EVAULATION OF SEED PRIMING ON GROWTH AND YEILD OF CHICKPEA (Cicer arientinum L.)
Type of the 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important both for the scientific community and the farmers' community to increase the yield of chickpeas.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable and concise.</p> <p>3. The abstract needs to be improved. Add some more information on the importance of chickpeas and the methodology used in the experiment.</p> <p>4. The subsections are Okey.</p> <p>5. The manuscript needs to be improved on materials and methods (methodology): If all seed priming applications were 4 hours, so you don't need to write down "for 4 hours" in every single treatment. Just do it once at the beginning of the treatments.</p> <p>What control treatment actually?</p> <p>How many replications were used in the experiment?</p> <p>How many seeds were used for each experimental unit?</p> <p>What is the plant spacing?</p> <p>What statistics analysis was used? On the tables, please show (by printing in bold) which priming treatments give the best and/or the worst response of the parameters. IPB University, Indonesia</p> <p>6. The number of references need to be improved, and please add more resent/up to date references.</p> <p>7. Please write the manuscript more concisely.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English needs to be improved a lot.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Darda Efendi
Department, University & Country	IPB University, Indonesia