

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>                                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJECC_100145</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Response of Foliar spray of Iron and Gibberallic acid on growth and Yield of Green gram</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments<br><br><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><br><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><br><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><br><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community.<br>In general, this article provides information about response of foliar spray of Iron and Gibberallic acid on growth and Yield of Green gram<br><br>2. The title of the article is suitable.<br><br>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.<br><br>4. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.<br><br>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.<br><br>6. The references are sufficient and recent.<br><br>Shallow discussion.<br>Some variables are not discussed. |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><br><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | The quality of language/English articles is suitable for scientific communication.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Paragraph too long. The main sentence is not clear.  |   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Ary Susatyo Nugroho</b>                 |
| Department, University & Country | <b>PGRI Semarang University, Indonesia</b> |