

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98343
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen and weed management practices of growth and yield of Blackgram (Vigna mungo 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>)

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)	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. Title should be Effect of nitrogen and weed management practices of growth and development of Blackgram (Vigna mungo L.) Abstract is comprehensive. But major findings of the study should be mentioned. Sub sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct and have some practical importance. Some recent references should be added to improve the quality of the manuscript. Proper format of the references should be added.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Sentences are grammatically correct.	
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:	Arindam Ghosh
Department, University & Country	Sister Nivedita University, India