

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJECC_89724   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of moisture conservation practices and fertility levels on rabi safflower ( <i>Carthamus tinctorius</i> L.) |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research 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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>The core principle of this work is sound, but the presentation is so poor, and the language is a jumble of weak sentences.</p> <p>There are several verbs and sentences that have been repeated more than once. This manuscript was written in thesis format.</p> <p>The writers were unable to address the research objectives issue because there are no longer any modes of action that are well-supported by graphics.</p> <p>The authors were unable to effectively respond to the original study's main question by covering essential subtopics. Data were not included in the abstract section. Furthermore, the "3. Methodology" section is useless and lacking in information and details.</p> <p>The writer listed all the titles with their findings in the results and discussion section, but did not discuss each point independently.</p> <p>This study employed the oldest references to support their methods, observations, and conclusions. In their images and charts, I couldn't find any organisation or detailed explanation. They were a shambles. Besides that, the discussion section was a total mess (meaningless).</p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |   |   |

### 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) |
|--|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | Shahira H. EL-Moslamy   |
| Department, University & Country | Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute (GEBRI), City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications (SRTA-city), Egypt |