

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_116298</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Combining Microbial-Enriched Organic Manures with Inorganic Nutrients on Physiological Characteristics and Productivity of Pearl Millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Yes, the manuscript is found to important for scientific community because it will helps to create the importance of organic manures for good yield, soil health and nutrition part.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, title is suitable for the research content</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive according to the manuscript.</b></p> <p>Yes, methodology found to be appropriate for the research and discussion of results was scientifically correct. Yes, its content of manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes, reference is sufficient for the manuscript</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>Good</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the research manuscript is good and innovative in the scientific concepts.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>M. Pushpa Devi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kongunadu Arts and Science College, India</b>