

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_94967
Title of the Manuscript:	Determining Length of Growing Period for Crop Planning in East and South Eastern Coastal Plain Agroclimatic Zone of Odisha
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Review Comments Follow the guidelines and format of the journal for the abstract and other sections of the paper. The Abstract is poorly written. It requires to be improved. The author (s) have put up introduction part appropriately. The last two paragraphs of this part can be merged together and the objective could be set with better background. Presently, the setting of objective background is not upto mark. Although there are many methods for estimation of LGP, the authors have employed appropriate and standard methods. Methodology appears to be okay. Results and discussion part is sparsely written. Table 2 can be presented in Fig,. Remove Table 4. The text of result is not upto the mark. Table 6 is not mentioned in the text. Whole result and discussion part should be recast in order to have a better presentation. Literature of the paper is poorly built and there are several grammatical mistakes. It is advised to go through the paper word by word and line by line to ensure error free manuscript. The paper may be accepted for publication upon correction and revision as suggested.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdus Sattar
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, India