

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>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)</li> </ol>	<p>By reviewing the research, he found some observations that must be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The title is good and consistent with the content</li> <li>• The summary is good ,but The key words in the summary are more than recommended, so the number of words should be reduced.</li> <li>• The search is good in terms of introduction.</li> <li>• The materials and methods are good,</li> <li>• the results and discussions are very good.</li> <li>• Review the figures in the text and tables in the results and discussion and make sure they are accurate</li> <li>• The number of sources used is very good.</li> </ul>	The correction has been done
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Salam Thanoon Khaleel Alabar
Department, University & Country	Iraq