

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96822
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Spacing and Potassium Levels on Yield and Economics of Foxtail millet (<i>Setaria italica</i> 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>)

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The issue raised was good, but the way of presentation was not smart enough to get readers attention.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract should be stand alone or transfer complete information provided in the manuscript shortly; however, in the given manuscript the abstract fail to include the introduction and conclusion of the main finding.</p> <p>4. I suggest the table should be placed in appropriate place in the result and discussion part of the manuscript and referred in the text.</p> <p>5. I think it require revision to become acceptable in the scientific community.</p> <p>6. The references also require revision. Eg. "Shankar Charate, Thimmegowda, M. N., Gangadhar Eswar Rao, Ramachandrappa, B. K. and Sathish, A. Effect of Nitrogen and Potassium Levels on Growth and Yield of Little Millet (<i>Panicum sumatrense</i>) under Dryland Alfisols of southern Karnataka. <i>Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.</i> 6 (6): 918-923". This reference fails to describe year of publication or status of the manuscript. The authors need to follow consistent reference writing format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I try to explore some error in terms uniformity, consistency and some typographical errors in the manuscript. Therefore, I suggest the author should be revising and modify in order to trap readers attention.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is better to submit the manuscript in in word than PDF version for more suggestion in the track change.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Woldu Mogesse Eshete
Department, University & Country	Haramaya University, Ethiopia