

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96908
Title of the Manuscript:	Pearl Millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.) Var NBH-5658 as Influenced by Potassium & Plant growth regulators Effects on Growth Parameters and Yield
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)
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. It has regional importance 2. Title is changed 3. Abstract is suitable 4. Sections are appropriate 5. According to results the plants applied the highest amount of P and growth regulators give the best yield, it is compatible with knowledge. 6. Some references too old. All References in the Manuscript given in different forms It must be corrected.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, Authors should review the article it has many mistakes.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Esra Cebeci
Department, University & Country	Bati Akdeniz Agricultural Research Institute, Turkiye