

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126456
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF FOXTAIL MILLET VARIETIES FOR THERMOTOLERANCE AT SEEDLING STAGE USING TEMPERATURE INDUCTION RESPONSE TECHNIQUE(TIR)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is found to be very important in that it may give insights to identify varieties of the crops in response to temperature stress. It may be used as an initial work for further studies conducted in the future.	--
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and good issue	--
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.	The abstract is not comprehensive. I have incorporated comments in the manuscript. The abstract should include introduction, objective, methods, results, recommendation briefly.	Introduction was added . Abstact already includes the methods , results and recommendations
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are not appropriate. The authors should evaluate the varieties based on the different parameters of the crops.	Based on the percent survival of seedlings, root growth and shoot growth at lethal and induction temperature varieties were classified into tolerant and sensitive varieties. Carried out some corrections
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.	A scientifically robust and technically sound manuscript shows well-supported arguments, rigorous methodology, and clear, logical structure. The research questions are not clearly defined and addressed through established or innovative methods and so it lacks scientific correctness. The data analysis is not thorough, and adhering to appropriate statistical or qualitative techniques. The results are not directly answering the research questions without overgeneralization. The manuscript does not discuss limitations transparently.	As per the standardised protocol mentioned in the introductions, the temperatures were standardised for the foxtail millet crop in the present experiment. Data was analysed by using
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are not suffiecient and there some old references (2006).	The references are used as and when citation is necessary
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is somewhat good.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I put all the comments in the manuscript as track changes	Track changes which are suggested are carried out to improve the manuscript. Some are ignored as there is relevant information in the manuscript

Review Form 3

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	