

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_107918
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, yield and quality of garilic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.) influenced by the application of sulphur and salicylic acid
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This research is important because it mentions which substrates can be used for optimal garlic growth. It also favors the economy of the farmers.</p> <p>The title of the paper is appropriate.</p> <p>No. Only the most statistically relevant results should be mentioned and the conclusions</p> <p>Yes, they are adequate. The only thing missing is the subsection on conclusions.should be mentioned.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>They are adequate, although you can look for more to expand the comments in the discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Nowhere in the results and discussion is it mentioned that the results are in Table 1. The results should be summarized in the text since they are all in Table 1, and only mention the most relevant data with their respective statistics. As well as to expand the discussion. If a statistical method was carried out, the results do not reflect this statistic, that is, they do not mention whether or not there were statistical differences with the application of these substrates.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María Elena Carranco Jáuregui
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition, Mexico