

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_109485</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Rhizobium, PSB and Mo on growth of different varieties of kabuli chickpea (Cicer kabulinum L.).</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is significant to the scientific community. This work is relevant to apply a nutritional protocol for the cultivation of chickpeas, using microorganisms, reducing the use of industrialized fertilizers, and thus contributing to the sustainable cultivation of this plant of great agricultural interest.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is. However, it is necessary to write the names according to the rules of biological classification.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and complete.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript to be accurate in terms of science.</p> <p>6. Yes, there are current, recent and enough references. However, there is a reference from 1999 in this work, I suggest updating this information with recent articles.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The article's English language quality, in my opinion, is appropriate for scholarly communications that demonstrate a strong scientific linguistic quality. The English language can be improved, though. For these reasons I suggest: 1) submit the manuscript for English grammar review by a professional English language specialist. 2) control and corrections using the grammarly with the Quillbot program, which also suggests simplifications and semantic corrections, see the web page: <a href="https://quillbot.com/grammarcheckrammarchecker?utm_medium=paid_search&amp;utm_source=google&amp;utm_campaign=dsa_developing&amp;campaign_type=search">https://quillbot.com/grammarcheckrammarchecker?utm_medium=paid_search&amp;utm_source=google&amp;utm_campaign=dsa_developing&amp;campaign_type=search</a></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><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>Antônio Francisco de Sousa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>E.E.E.P Dom Walfrido Teixeira Vieira, Brazil</b>