

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105119
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of barley (<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L.) to water deficit – physiological, biochemical and molecular perspectives
Type of the Article	Review 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important for the scientific community provided that the topics are discussed in detail with keeping their chronological order.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript should be edited as:</p> <p>“Morphological, Physiological, Biochemical and Molecular response of Barley (<i>H. Vulgare</i> L.) to water deficiency”</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive as far as the minor editorials are included.</p> <p>4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript isn't appropriate. Rearrangement is needed.</p> <p>5. Yes, scientifically the manuscript is correct and in most cases, arguments and remarks in the manuscripts get supported with scientific data/evidence</p> <p>6. Ample of references are listed and used. There is no need of adding more.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I advise the authors to revise the manuscript. Some of the sentence are very long and found to be difficult for an ease understanding. Reshuffling the sentence and topics in the body is also critically important.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I as a reviewer commented the manuscript to be revised well, organized again and broaden some topics.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getachew Melaku Adane
Department, University & Country	Bio and Emerging Technology Institute, Ethiopia