

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)	1. The manuscript is appropriate for the target of journal and audience. The manuscript fulfils the journal's remit the relevance in terms of subject area and target audience 2. The title is appropriate and the novelty of the findings is a fundamental requirement for a research article. The title is clear and straightforward; also paper's title is enticing potential readers. 3. The abstract is descriptive and tell clearly to the readers about the findings of this study are relevant to them. 4. The structure is logic and coherent, the data technically sound and do they support the conclusions. 5. The results presented in this manuscript are entirely original and scientifically correct. Considering these the study represents a significant conceptual advance over previously published studies and extends the current knowledge on this topic. 6. The references are quiet recent but they are too few. In my opinion for a better documentation are necessary more bibliographic titles.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used is appropriate; it is accessible to specialist readers.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roman Ioana
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania