Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_106328**
Title of the Manuscript:	**INFLUENCE OF SPECIFIC GRAVITY GRADING USING FLOATATION TECHNIQUE ON SEED AND SEEDLING QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS IN AMARANTHUS Cv. PLR 1**
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)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes, the manuscript holds significance for the scientific community as it investigates the influence of specific gravity grading through flotation techniques on seed and seedling quality characteristics in Amaranthus Cv. PLR 1, addressing a crucial aspect of crop improvement and agriculture.** **The title "INFLUENCE OF SPECIFIC GRAVITY GRADING USING FLOATATION TECHNIQUE ON SEED AND SEEDLING QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS IN AMARANTHUS Cv. PLR 1" is suitable as it accurately reflects the research focus and scope of the manuscript.** **The abstract provides a general overview of the study, but it lacks specific details about the methods, quantitative results, and broader implications, which would make it more comprehensive.(refer below)** **If it is an original article, it is always advisable to have a detailed methodology section with sub sections for clear understanding.** **Yes, it is scientifically correct.** **References are good, but then it is not cited in the journal according to the author guidelines mentioned in the journal - International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. The references should be cited with [1] format.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**The language is understandable, but need some corrections, inside with the spelling. And since they have mentioned the genus name, it should always start with the Capital letter.**	
Optional/General comments	**Each figure should have a caption. Figure legends should be given below the figures.** **Figure should be cited in the respective sections as a reference.** **Need to mention the source of figure obtained.** **References should be numbered.** **3) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **The abstract provides a good overview of the research study but could be more comprehensive by including a few additional details. Here's why:** **Methods Overview: The abstract mentions the use of organic solvents for floatation grading but doesn't provide specific details about the experimental setup, duration, or any notable parameters involved in the grading process. Including a brief overview of the methods used would make the abstract more comprehensive.** **Quantitative Results: While the abstract mentions that sinker fractions performed better than floater fractions and that Dichloromethane had greater grading ability, it doesn't provide specific quantitative results or percentages. Including some key quantitative findings, such as germination percentages or vigor index values, would enhance the comprehensiveness of the abstract.** **Conclusion: The abstract briefly touches on the potential adoption of Dichloromethane for specific gravity grading but doesn't elaborate on the broader implications or significance of the results. A concise conclusion statement summarizing the practical implications or future research directions would make the abstract more complete.**	

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**M. Manjuladevi**
Department, University & Country	**SNS College of Technology, India**