

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_110258</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Response of crop establishment methods and weed management practices on weed flora, crop growth and yield of wheat in maize-wheat-greengram cropping system</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes. The topic is on relevant crop protection methods. The findings can be used as important reference for research. The findings can assist in the development of new research.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, but it needs to be rephrased. I suggested changes on the manuscript.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes. The Abstract would benefit from improved sentence construction. I made suggestion on the manuscript.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes. Minor revisions are required according to the journal guidelines.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, but the author needs to make sure that the statistical analysis is fully explained and indications of statistical measures must be clear in the Tables. I made suggestions in the manuscript.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes. I suggest the author should also read the following articles to improve the literature review and interpretation of data:</b>  <a href="https://journal.fi/afs/article/view/72678">https://journal.fi/afs/article/view/72678</a>  <a href="https://www.scielo.br/j/pd/a/vFwDjBvK5Yq6xZVqm6kmSRf/?lang=en&amp;format=html">https://www.scielo.br/j/pd/a/vFwDjBvK5Yq6xZVqm6kmSRf/?lang=en&amp;format=html</a></p> <p><b>Please consider the editorial comments I made directly on the manuscript.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Please consider the editorial comments/corrections I made on the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I made my comments directly on the manuscript.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Albert T Modi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Kwa Zulu, South Africa</b>