

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105331
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of seed invigoration treatments on seed quality and seedling vigour in 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>)

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is extremely important for scientific community as it detailed the significant contribution of Different seed priming techniques in fodder maize crop No. The title of the article should be renamed as "Assessment of Influence of seed invigoration techniques on seed germination, seed quality & seedling vigour on Fodder Maize (Zea mays L.)" Yes the abstract of the article have meticulously represented the scientific findings of the manuscript. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate but if possible acknowledgement should be added. Yes the manuscript is scientifically very much correct & praiseworthy Yes the references were sufficient but more than 14nos. of references were more than 10years old. If possible, author should add reference within 10years before publication (2013 onwards) Add some more discussion for each parameters 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Analysis of soil samples should have been conducted for soil fertility before sowing. The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications but can be improved by adding more scientific reasons in the result & discussion part of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper is short on discussion part. Economic analysis part & some photographs of priming should have been added to add more authenticity to the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niroj Kumar Jena
Department, University & Country	Odisha University of Agriculture & Technology, India