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

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.	**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.**	
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.**	
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.**	
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).**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language is somewhat good.	
Optional/General comments	I put all the comments in the manuscript as track changes	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Animut Mekuriaw**
Department, University & Country	**Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia**