Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_106490**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Study of nitrogen rates and nano urea effects on physiological parameters and yield of Safflower (Carthamus tinctorius L.)**
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)**	**1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical issue in agriculture - optimizing nitrogen use in safflower cultivation. It provides valuable insights into the impact of different nitrogen fertilization methods on safflower growth and yield, which can have implications for sustainable farming practices and environmental conservation.** **2. The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It clearly conveys the focus of the study, which is the effect of nitrogen fertilization and foliar application of nano urea on safflower.** **3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a concise summary of the research objectives, methods, key findings, and implications. It effectively communicates the scope and significance of the study.** **4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper follows a logical flow, starting with the introduction, followed by materials and methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. Each section is well-defined and contributes to the overall coherence of the manuscript.** **5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the information presented. The methodology is well-documented, and the results are consistent with the research objectives. However, as with any scientific study, a peer review process would further validate the scientific accuracy.** **6. The references provided are relevant and offer a solid foundation for the research. However, it's advisable to ensure that the most recent and up-to-date sources are included to strengthen the paper's academic rigor. Additionally, if there are specific areas where additional references could enhance the discussion or support certain points, the authors may consider incorporating them for a more comprehensive literature review.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written with clear language and concise explanations. It effectively conveys the research findings and concepts to the intended audience, making it suitable for scholarly communication. However, as with any document, a final proofreading pass to catch any minor grammatical or typographical errors is advisable before publication.**	
Optional/General comments	**The manuscript provides valuable insights into optimizing nitrogen use in safflower cultivation, addressing both agricultural productivity and environmental concerns. It is well-structured, with clear objectives, a comprehensive methodology, and meaningful results. The discussion effectively interprets the findings, and the conclusion aligns with the research objectives.** **However, I recommend minor revisions to further enhance the paper:** **1. Consider incorporating visual representations of data, such as charts or graphs, to make the results more accessible and engaging for readers.**	

	2. Include specific recommendations or implications for safflower farmers and agricultural practices based on the study's findings to enhance practical relevance. **3. Ensure that the references are the most recent and up-to-date to strengthen the paper's academic rigor.**	

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:	**Mahmoud Abbas Ali**
Department, University & Country	**South Valley University, Egypt**