

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104630
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Weed Management Practices on Growth, Yield Attributes and Yield of Clusterbean [Cyamopsis tetragonoloba (L.) Taub]
Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient, 55.6% of them is recent and 44.4% of them is old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Optional/General comments</p> <p>1- In the abstract, over control must be deleted.</p> <p>2. In the introduction, fabaceae, papilionaceae, state, tonnes and per cent must be written Fabaceae, Papilionaceae, State, tones and percent respectively.</p> <p>3- In results there are two ands among the Latin names of weeds which found in the experimental site, must be deleted.</p> <p>4- The first line in 3.2 the word were must be written is.</p> <p>5- In researches the experiment must be repeated in the next season.</p> <p>6- Fig 1 must be mentioned before the two tables according to their appearance in the text.</p> <p>7- The rates of all herbicides used in the experiment must be written in the text and tables specially their mixtures.</p> <p>8- Results must be compared with the results of The previous researches.</p> <p>9- Important results must be discussed</p> <p>10- Discussion is insufficient.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukhtar Abdel Aziz Mohamed Osman
Department, University & Country	University of Dongola, Sudan