

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98675
Title of the Manuscript:	Source-Sink Alterations in Rice Fallow Adaptive Blackgram Variety ADT3 for Enhancement of Yield and Quality of Seed
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)
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)	abstract does not mention the research method used the introduction is only one paragraph and has not been able to describe the formulation of the problem and the novelty of the research idea results and discussion should be able to provide an analysis of the data obtained, not just describe the data table results and discussion should be able to provide an analysis of the data obtained, not just describe the data table adjust the conclusions with the formulation of the problem and discussion use the latest references for the last 10 years or so and it would be better to use Mendeley or Zetero	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	please be consistent in writing units	
Optional/General comments	in the discussion section, table and figure data should be analyzed, not limited to describing the results	

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:	I Nengah Muliarta
Department, University & Country	Warmadewa University, Indonesia