

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99296
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of different levels of Sulphur and foliar application of boron on zaid sunflower (<i>Helianthus annuus L.</i>)
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)	The study of the influence of trace elements on the growth and development of crops is a very important aspect in agronomy. Sunflower is one of the most popular crops in the world, so studying the technological aspects of its cultivation is important. The title of the article fully corresponds to the presented materials. The abstract should be enlarged by the authors. The results of the research should be included in the abstract. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript correspond to the norms. The list of used literature has an insufficient number of sources. Even with such a small number, the authors used only 3 sources. It is unacceptable. Authors should take this comment seriously. The Materials and Methods section is poorly described. There are no research methods. There is no clarity of presentation of the place of research. No weather analysis. There is no agricultural technology for growing crops. The results of the study are poorly analyzed. A deeper analysis of the data is needed. The conclusions need to be revised. The section should contain concrete results.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Sergiy Lavrenko
Department, University & Country	Kherson State Agrarian and Economic University, Ukraine