

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_117139
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Effects of Drought Stress on Biomass and Yield Traits in Sorghum Genotypes
Type of the 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>Sorghum is a crop of global importance. Rabi sorghum is particularly important in peninsular India where it is grown on a rain-fed basis. However, drought-prone regions face challenges as water stress negatively impacts overall plant development and yield. From this point of view, the selection of a suitable variety for specific regional conditions makes the present study relevant.</p> <p>The title reflects the purpose of the research conducted.</p> <p>The abstract reflects the main elements of the research carried out, but it is necessary to revise it structurally. It is unnecessary to put titles on individual parts of the abstract. The text needs to be revised and be as a whole.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I believe that the quality of the manuscript will improve if the authors consider the following recommendations: 1. I would recommend that the abstract be re-edited, according to my remark above. 2. Not only the irrigation schedules (35 and 65 days) but also the amount of water supplied must be specified. In addition, it is necessary to specify the amount of annual rainfall, too.. 3. In the methodology, it is good to explain the individual definitions used such as, what is meant by economic yield, biological yield, etc.... 4. In the conclusions, it is good to have more specific data from the obtained research results 5. These authors are not cited in the manuscript - Fernandez GCJ and Gardner.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I can't comment on the quality of the English language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	G. Kostadinov
Department, University & Country	Bulgaria