

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_120522
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability Studies for Morpho-Physiological and Yield Attributing Traits in Foxtail Millet (<i>Setaria italica</i> L. Beauv.)
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject seems relevant because: millet cultivation is underutilized, possessing resistance to abiotic stress. • The chosen parameters are rich and varied. • However, the research reports multi-localized tests but we have no information on the pedo-climatic conditions of these localities. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The experiment is what it is: investigation or monitoring at the level of the Regional Agricultural Research Station. Nandyal during Rabi, 2023-24.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure of the article is made according to the IMRD method.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article may have more scientific accuracy if it integrates the environmental conditions of the test sites and their effects.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes the references seem sufficient and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dhia Gharabi
Department, University & Country	Ibn Kaldoun University, Algeria