

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111939
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of different varieties and genotypes of aonla (<i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn.) under sodic soil condition of Eastern Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.The manuscript will inform the scientific community on the best adaptive, performing and high yielding variety of Aonla in the Eastern Uttar Pradesh, this will assist in selection and breeding purposes.</p> <p>2.The title is relevant as it clearly outlines the main objective of the study.</p> <p>3. There is a chronological flow of the contents in the abstract, within the abstract there is the purpose of study, experimental design, methods and major findings of the study. Those are the key elements of the abstract.</p> <p>4.Yes</p> <p>5. The methods used are scientifically correct, however the statistical analysis of the results has not been included or stated.</p> <p>7. The references are relevant, however search for more references that can explain or justify the fruiting behaviour, yield and quality of the studied genotypes</p> <p>Indicate in the materials and methods the statistical analysis methods used, what was used to separate the means, at what probability.</p> <p>From the findings, what are the reasons why the genotype NA-26 was performing better than others, can the author elaborate why the other genotypes behaved the way they did using the parameters tested. There must be a reason why the fruiting habit, yield and quality of NA-26 was higher than that of other genotypes, similarly there should be a reason why the lowest performing genotype behaved in that manner in that environment.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is informative but it would have been interesting and more informative to repeat it to verify the findings.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Onkgolotse G.Moatshe-Mashiqa
Department, University & Country	Botswana