

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105033
Title of the Manuscript:	Varietal Evaluation in Marigold (Tagetes spp.) for better growth and yield Under Prayagraj Agro Climatic Conditions
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? It is important to the scientific world as another source of revenue</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract is ok</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed Views of the author are must clearly come out. The tables must clearly show the statistics 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is a important manuscript but the author(s) need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve on the tables to look scientific avoid being formatted 	

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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Felix Mereka Chipojola
Department, University & Country	Malawi