Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_98413**
Title of the Manuscript:	**"Impact of sulphur levels and boron on growth and yield of summer green gram (Vigna radiata 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)

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	This paper is of particular value because it simultaneously analyzes the effect of sulfur and boron levels on growth, yield, and economics of summer green gram. Thus, this manuscript is useful for at least 2 scientific communities, namely the agronomy scientific community and the agribusiness scientific community. This manuscript has additional uses if further research follows the recommendations I suggest below. The title of the article should be changed to: **"Impact of sulphur and boron levels on growth, yield, and economics of summer green gram."** The abstract of the article is comprehensive when written as below: A field experiment was conducted during *Zaid* 2022 at Crop Research Farm, Department of Agronomy, SHUATS, Prayagraj (UP) to determine the impact of sulphur levels and boron on growth, yield, and economics of summer green gram (*Vigna radiata* L.). Viewed from 6 the growth parameters studied, the results showed that treatment 9 [Sulfur (15 kg/ha) + Boron (0.6%)] showed the highest performance of all treatments with a plant height of 47.5 cm, number of branches/plants 8.80, plant dry weight 7.38 g, number of nodules/plant 7.40, crop growth rate 1.1 g/m2/day, and relative growth rate 0.0409 g/m2/day. Indeed, there was no significant difference between all natural treatments for the last two parameters (crop growth rate relative growth rate). However, in terms of plant dry weight, no treatment was statistically equivalent to this treatment. As with growth parameters, the results showed that treatment 9 also showed the best performance for all yield attributes studied with the number of pods/plants 29.4, the number of seeds/pods 10.33, the test weight 29.80 g, the seed yield 1.21 t /ha, the haulm yield is 2.81 tons/ha, and the harvest index is 30.3%. From this number of pods/plants, except for treatment 8, treatment 9 was significantly different from the other 8 treatments. In the number of seeds/pods there was a significant difference between the treatments, but in the test weight there was no significant difference between all the treatments. In terms of seed yield and haulm yield, treatment 9 was only equivalent to treatment 8, treatment 6, and treatment 5, but was significantly different from the other 6 treatments. In the harvest index, treatment 9 was equivalent to treatment 8, treatment 6, treatment 5, and treatment 4, but was significantly different from the other 5 treatments. As with growth and yield attributes, from an economic standpoint, the maximum gross returns, net returns, and benefit-cost ratio of treatment 9 recorded the highest value compared to other treatments. The maximum gross returns, net returns, and benefit-cost ratio values are 82,022.00 INR/ha, 53,522.30 INR/ha, and 1.88 respectively. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The net returns (INR/ha) of each treatment must be corrected so that the net returns of treatment 1, treatment 2, treatment 3, treatment 4, treatment 5, treatment 6, treatment 7, treatment 8, treatment 9, and control are respectively 27168.30, 29561.30, 33278.30, 37260.30, 41639.30, 45356.30, 39408.30, 51707.30, 53522.30, and 25275.30 (Table 3). Likewise the value of the B: C ratio in 6 treatments must be corrected. Thus the value of the ratio B: C in treatment 1, treatment 2, treatment 4, treatment 6, treatment 7, and treatment 9 are respectively 1.01, 1.09, 1.36, 1.62, 1.41, and 1.88. Correction of result and discussion must be carried out by referring to the improvements made to the abstract. If it is fulfilled, the quality of the English article is suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General 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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Henrykus Sihaloho**
Department, University & Country	**Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas, Indonesia**