

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105957</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of foliar feeding of plant growth regulators and nutrients on leaf nutrient status of Guava (Psidium guajava L.) cv. Gwalior-27</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><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>Yes, it is. Author/s concluded that the treatment of nutrients was found to be effective in maximising the leaf N content, leaf boron content, leaf zinc content and leaf calcium content significantly.</p> <p><b>Yes, it is.</b></p> <p><b>It is not clear.</b> It needs to be rewritten.</p> <p><b>Yes, they are.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, it is.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, they are. However, there are many old references.</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>Yes, it is.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Abstract is not clear. It needs to be rewritten.</li> <li>- Manuscript needs new references. There are many old references.</li> </ul>	

### 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>Abdullah Hassn Mohammed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Agriculture, Tikrit University, Iraq</b>