

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_109125</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Integrated Nutrient Management and Salicylic acid Improves Grain Yield of Quinoa (<i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd.) Subjected to Moisture Deficit Stress</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The underlying premise of this work is sound; however, the presentation is terrible, and the language is a hodgepodge of weak sentences. Several verbs and sentences have been used more than once. The authors were unable to appropriately respond to the original study's core question by covering critical subtopics. The introduction did not address all of the research topic's points, and the reference utilized is somewhat old. The procedures employed require additional clarification by describing all of the details. Furthermore, the research methodology is devoid of facts and specifics. What statistical software was used in this study? Please utilize statistical analysis to support anything you've said. In the results and discussion section, the writer listed all of the findings but did not discuss each issue separately. There were numerous mistakes in the references section, which was disorganized. The writers were unable to address the research objectives issue because there are no longer any modes of action that are well supported by graphics. This study relied on the most ancient references to back up their introduction, methods, observations, results, and discussion. Additionally, the conclusion section was a complete mess of information. In addition, the results and discussion section are useless and lacking in information and details. It's difficult to understand the abstract and conclusion sections.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shahira H. EL-Moslamy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, Egypt</b>