

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105483
Title of the Manuscript:	SEED BASED INTERVENTION IN PRODUCTION OF ELITE SEEDLING SUITABLE FOR MACHINE TRANSPLANTING IN RICE
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The research advances the field of agriculture by providing insight into more effective operations for a global staple crop. This research will also have positive implications for food security. Suggested Title: SEED-BASED INTERVENTION IN THE PRODUCTION OF ELITE SEEDLING SUITABLE FOR MACHINE TRANSPLANTING IN RICE The abstract needs to have more information about how the research solves more big-picture problems. Table 1 needs to be moved to the Results Section. The sections are organized acceptably, but I think the statistical analysis, which is a sentence, could use more detail. Additionally, the conclusion could use more detail as well. The conclusions should be a solid paragraph. I think the data collection is fine, but the uncertainties regarding the studies should be discussed more. The reference list is sufficient, but a few more recent references from the last 10 years would bolster the paper. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Overall, the language is suitable, but please see the suggestions in the document.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Overall, this is a specific yet important research topic, and with improvement, this could be a great paper.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jaime Thissen
Department, University & Country	United States