

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110742
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of safflower varieties under different dates of sowing and crop-weather relationships
Type of the Article	Review 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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is valuable for the scientific community. The title of the article is appropriate; however, as specified in my request within the manuscript, please include the name of the study area. The article's abstract lacks comprehensiveness, but I have provided comments in the manuscript's comment section for corrections. Additionally, I have removed some irrelevant sentences. In subsection 3.2, it has been noted that units of quantities were included in the title and have been asked to remove. However, the overall structure of the manuscript is commendable. The manuscript is scientifically sound. The references are generally insufficient. I pointed out specific areas in the introduction that necessitate pertinent and up-to-date citations. <p>The author(s) are encouraged to thoroughly revise the manuscript and thoughtfully address the comments provided in the comments section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality is not particularly strong; nevertheless, running the manuscript through Grammarly can enhance its spellings, punctuation, word choice, and language structure, thereby improving the overall quality of the English.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To the Editor</p> <p>I encountered challenges in providing feedback on the formatting the style of units for values, citation and referencing styles, as well as determining the maximum word count for the abstract. If a comprehensive guide for authors was supplied and distributed to reviewers, it would facilitate the establishment of a consistent paper style as per the guidelines of the IJECC</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:	Nuhu Steven Kuba
Department, University & Country	Plateau State Polytechnic Barkin-Ladi, Nigeria