

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_91605
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different sowing date and varieties on Mustard growth and yield in Prayagraj conditions
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

Compulsory REVISION 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)
ABSTRACT	The abstract of the manuscript should be revised in a way that contain the relevant information of the paper in a concise and clear way. It is shallow and incomplete and is not the short form of the whole paper. Even the statement of problem and objectives of the manuscript should be indicated in the abstract. For further information, please look at the comments written on manuscript.	
INTRODUCTION	The introduction part of the paper should be revised according to the comments given on the paper. The paragraph should be partitioned in to a number of appropriate paragraphs. It needs rearrangement of sentences. Statement of problem and objectives are totally missed. It will be better if some ideas on the production problem of the crop or statement of problem are included. Additionally, at the end of the introduction objectives of the research are necessary either in sentence or whatever way you like. For further information please look at the comments written on manuscript.	
MATERIAL AND METHODS	This part of the manuscript is almost below minimum requirement. Please look the comments on the main paper. It is better if you put the description of study area, description of planting material, treatments and experimental design, experimental procedures and agronomic practices, data collection (phonological data, growth date, yield and yield component data), and data analysis in separate and sequential sub-titles together with the relevant information under each of them. In your paper a number of very important information's are missed like data collected, methods of data collection and data analysis.	

Review Form 1.6

RESULT AND DISCUSSION	The result and discussion part is not well written as it is a research paper. Like the methodology part, this part of your manuscript is very shallow and needs major modification starting from partitioning in to different sub- and sub-sub titles based on the type parameters like phonological, growth and yield components. Additionally, the discussion part and justification are totally missed. Honestly this part is the part that needs major modification, please look the comments given on the main manuscript.	
Conclusion	Very short. Please try to summarize and conclude your finding starting from the back ground of the crop, statement of problem, result and discussion and conclusion	
Minor REVISION comments	There are some technical issues on the paper like punctuation and grammar	
Optional/General comments 1. Citation	One of the qualities of a research paper is availability of sufficient evidence for the written paragraphs. All of paragraphs have no source in this paper, so please support with the relevant source.	
2. Detail ness and originality	All of the main parts of the paper starting from the abstract to the conclusion lacks detail ness. This raises a question of originality of the work. To me it is difficult to say it is a scientific and experimental work submitted to one of the peer review journal. Thus please go through to each and every of the comments given on both the here and on the main manuscript and incorporate accordingly for the betterment of paper and for further steps.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Endalkachew Baye Endalkachew Baye
Department, University & Country	Salale University, Ethiopia