

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99531</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Revitalizing the Potential of Minor Millets: Agrarian Constraints, Possible Solutions and Future Roadmap</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review 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 REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>As mentioned by the authors, the subject is of high interest, simply by the good characteristics of Minor Millet.</b> 2. <b>Yes, I consider that the title is suitable.</b> 3. <b>The Abstract is short, but very well structured.</b> 4. <b>For a Review Article, the structure is appropriate.</b> 5. <b>As far as I can tell and check, the manuscript seems to be correct from scientifically point of view.</b> 6. <b>There are enough references, even for a review paper. Also, many of the cited articles are new and appropriate for this subject.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Good English and attention to details – expressions, punctuation etc.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Table 1 don't look well in its current form – please integrate it in the text (same font and size, AutoFit to Window...).	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Horoias Roxana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</b>