

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJECC_111288</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Plant Growth, Yield and Secondary Metabolite Production in Turmeric (<i>Curcuma longa</i> L.) in Response to Chitin Application</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>   |

### 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><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(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 manuscript includes some unique findings along with some remarkable topics. In its field, research is good.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>The manuscript's writing was poorly done.</p> <p>Yes</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>Need to improve</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>1. The methodology did not specify how chitin was added to the soil.<br/>                 2. SD and the error bar are absent in figures.<br/>                 3. Additionally, figure quality is below journal quality.<br/>                 4. There was no HPTLC for chitin reported.<br/>                 5. The author did not specify where they purchased the chitin.<br/>                 6. No evidence supported the claim that chitin increases oleoresin and volatile oil. Need supporting data.<br/>                 7. The author described the impact of chitin on tomatoes in line 116, however the citation was incorrect.</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>Giresha A S</b>                         |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Jain Deemed-to-be University, India</b> |