

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101250
Title of the Manuscript:	Economics of Super seeder technique of Wheat Cultivation in Haryana
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>	<p>Yes, the benefits of SST VS CT have been discussed, which are important for scientific community</p> <p>The title is simple and comprehensive</p> <p>Abstract needs to be constructed in sub-sections as (aims/objectives, study design, methodology, results-----) as per journal guidelines. There is need of addition of significance of current study at end of abstract (one to two sentences) 3514 words as per journal recommendations (3000-6000) but "Acknowledgments and Competing Interests" sections are missing.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality of the article is suitable for readership.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In results SST and CT should only be used in abbreviated form, as these abbreviations have already been elaborated in introduction section Is there any statistical tool used to calculate the findings/observations/results? Comparison has not been made by measuring P-value as per journal guidelines</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Imran Abid
Department, University & Country	University of Strasbourg, France