

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC _106833
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different pre - sowing seed treatments on germination and growth of papaya(Carica papaya L.) seedlings cv. Arka Surya
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://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>The core principle of this work is sound, but the presentation is so poor, and the language is a jumble of weak sentences. There are several verbs and sentences that have been repeated more than once. The writers were unable to address the research objectives issue because there are no longer any modes of action that are well-supported by graphics.</p> <p><b>So, I won't accept</b> it unless the authors deal with the following problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Your manuscript's keywords, abstract and conclusion were poorly worded and lacked necessary details.</li> <li>In addition, the Introduction and methodology sections are useless and lacking in information and details.</li> <li>Please tabulate your treatments codes with description</li> <li>There were numerous mistakes in the references section (which was disorganized).</li> <li>It is best to include a photo of the actual application. In addition, there are no graphics or charts in your monitoring and reporting.</li> <li>It's important to discuss the techniques used in great detail.</li> <li>To be honest, it seems like your conclusion is utterly unclear.</li> <li>The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date.</li> </ul>	
<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>		

### 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>Shahira H. EL-Moslamy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt</b>