

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105383
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Potassium Solubilizing Bacteria (KSB) on the Performance of Sweet corn ( <i>Zea mays L. saccharata</i> ) in Potassium Sufficient Soil
Type of the 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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Potassium play a vital role in the growth of crop plants. The deficiency to the recommended level of the potassium resulted in the reduction of crop yield significantly. Hence, the study is very important for crop scientists.</p> <p>2. Title of the manuscript should be modified (check reviewed manuscript for recommended modifications (addition/substitutions)).</p> <p>3. <b>Abstract</b> is not comprehensive and is not understandable. The abstract should state briefly, the purpose of the research, the experimental design, the principal results and major the conclusions. It should be understandable, write in simple clear manner with short sentences. The highlighted sentence is too long and is not clear as well (check reviewed manuscript). Please mention all the abbreviations used in this article after keyword. <b>INTRODUCTION:</b> Please describe specifically; Which microorganisms are involve in potassium solubilization? In a separate paragraph. <b>MATERIALS AND METHODS:</b> Please mention complete methodology with citations, "How the soil was characterized?" Please mention complete methodology with citations, "How weekly mean maximum and minimum atmospheric temperature was determined?" Please describe which bacteria are used as potassium solubilizing bacteria? How leaf area index was calculated? How yield attributes were calculated such as cob weight plant<sup>-1</sup>, Cob girth and number of kernel row<sup>-1</sup> whereas, no. of cobplant<sup>-1</sup>, cob length, no. of kernel row cob<sup>-1</sup>. Please mention all methods and calculation with authentic citations. <b>ESULTS AND DISCUSSION:</b> Non-scientific words are used for the description of results. Way of writing of citations is also wrong please correct it. "optimization of photosynthesis" is a totally wrong assumption and not acceptable at all. "translocation of photosynthates from source to sink" is a totally wrong assumption. It is not acceptable at all.</p> <p>4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is not scientifically correct. Most of the reported results are may be scientifically incorrect because the methods used for the determination and calculation of these results are not mentioned in MATERIALS AND METHODS. This manuscript has incomplete methodology, not reliable results and wrong assumptions in discussion. Hence this manuscript is scientifically incorrect.</b></p> <p>6. <b>References are also in-sufficient.</b></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><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Comment [Dbf1]:** Its totally wrong assumption

**Comment [Dbf2]:** Totally wrong assumption. It is not acceptable at all.

**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>Bilqees Fatima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Minhaj University, Pakistan</b>