

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99133
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Micronutrients on growth and yield of Sorghum (Sorghum bicolor L.)
Type of the Article	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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes Yes One more treatment should be incorporate (trt 8) Ok Ok Insufficient Introduction should provide clear idea about identified problem for which experiment was laid out and what was the objective of experiment. Materials & methods should content climate, soil property of experimental site, months of experiment, variety used, more detailed description about treatments, cultural practice followed, observations recorded and method of data collection, formula used, statistical analysis performed. Discussion should mention numerical data of all treatments which were best and statistically at per. Conclusion should give equal importance to treatment 8	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
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:	Subhamoy Sikder
Department, University & Country	Uttar Banga Krishi Viswavidyalaya, India