

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97827
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Growth, Yield and Economics of SUNFLOWER ( <i>Helianthus annuus</i> L.) var. KBSH – 1 as influenced by Nitrogen and Spacing
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 REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The initial part of the abstract does not include the formulation of the problem which is the idea of the research. The abstract also does not describe the research method</li> <li><b>In the introductory part, there is quite a lot of data and statements whose sources are not clear in the literature. some of the literature sources used are also very old. It should use standard literature sources from the last 5-10 years</b></li> <li>The results and discussion section, no longer describes the results of the table. Provide analysis and reasons related to the data obtained</li> <li>the bibliography has not used the Mendeley application</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	uses several abbreviations, but the abbreviation is not given at the beginning	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	rewrite using the latest literature	

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