

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_128985
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing agriculture through radioactive tracer technology: applications, challenges, and future directions
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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: 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is so important to the scientific community because Radioactive tracer technology serves as a transformative method for investigating physiological and biochemical processes within fruit crops and enhances yields.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. But can be modify to "Agricultural optimization"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. The abstract is not really comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The references are good	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. But can be improved on.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is scientifically robust and correct, but a little improvement can be made	

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:	Ubulom, Simeon Reuben
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Nigeria