

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121836
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiological response of Jamun cv. Goma Priyanka plants to foliar humic acid and potassium silicate application
Type of the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Importance of the Manuscript This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a notable gap in understanding the physiological responses of Jamun cv. Goma Priyanka to foliar applications of humic acid and potassium silicate. The study's findings on enhanced plant growth, stress resilience, and physiological processes provide valuable insights that can inform agricultural practices, particularly in challenging environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Personal Evaluation	
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.	I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive approach to exploring the effects of humic acid and potassium silicate on Jamun plants. The detailed experimental design and robust analysis offer a clear understanding of the benefits these treatments can provide. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more concise presentation of its findings to improve readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Title Suitability	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The title "Physiological response of Jamun cv. Goma Priyanka plants to foliar humic acid and potassium silicate application" is suitable as it accurately reflects the study's focus. However, a slightly revised title such as "Enhancing Jamun cv. Goma Priyanka Growth and Stress Resilience through Foliar Humic Acid and Potassium Silicate Application" might better highlight the study's key findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Abstract Evaluation The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the study's objectives, methods, and key findings effectively. However, it could be improved by explicitly stating the main conclusions and potential applications of the research. Including specific data points or results would also strengthen the abstract. Manuscript Structure and Subsections The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate, allowing for a logical flow of	

Review Form 3

	<p>information. The detailed descriptions of the materials and methods, along with the clear presentation of results, contribute to the manuscript's readability and scientific rigor.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness</p> <p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-designed experimental framework, thorough data collection, and rigorous analysis. The study's methodology is clearly described, ensuring reproducibility, and the results are presented with sufficient detail to support the conclusions.</p> <p>References Evaluation</p> <p>The references are sufficient and include recent studies relevant to the topic. However, incorporating more recent publications from the last 2-3 years could further enhance the manuscript's relevance.</p> <p>Language and English Quality</p> <p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical corrections and stylistic improvements would enhance the manuscript's clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <p>1. Title: Consider revising to "Enhancing Jamun cv. Goma Priyanka Growth and Stress Resilience through Foliar Humic Acid and Potassium Silicate Application."</p> <p>2. Abstract: Include specific data points and explicitly state the main conclusions and potential applications.</p> <p>3. References: Add more recent studies from the past 2-3 years to strengthen the literature review.</p> <p>4. Language: Minor grammatical corrections and stylistic improvements for clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Petros Chavula</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Haramaya University, Ethiopia</p>