

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104888
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Nitrogen and Gibberellic acid on Growth, Yield and Economics of Fodder Maize (Zea mays 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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>No. The experimental site and method is insufficiently described. First the position of the experimental site is not given in terms of geographical longitude, latitude and altitude above sea level. Then there is no clear description of the grid of the allotment fields or test runs of the experiment. There is only mentioned that the test run "9" which is left undefined. The Rabi-season is undefined, therefore key informations for agroecology is missing. No. Alternative title: "Effects on xxx. A field experiment."</p> <p>No, because it is just cut and pasted from the section "material and method"</p> <p>It is by no means scientifically correct Too much implicit knowledge is assumed from the readers. That should be a scientific paper and not a diary, so it is also scientifically incorrect.</p> <p>Guess yes but the citation format should be standardized.</p> <p>Following extra points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definition of undefined variables wanted. 2. Rabi-season must be defined in the international calendar. 3. Precipitation patterns of the region are imperative since Maize is a C-4 Plant and needs therefore much water and may dry out the subseeds (usually beans, as done in Vavilov center #7, Mesoamerica). Leguminoses as subseeds are important for nitrogene fixing. 4. The description of the experimental fields are insufficient. I have no idea how the experiment was designed, it cannot be reproduced due to the defective description. 5. The variables of the experiment are insufficiently attributed. 6. What about the mentioned plant hormones? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Complete re-design of the paper is imperative to make the experiment replicable.	

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:	Uwe Christian Plachetka
Department, University & Country	Austria