

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The study focuses on finding the most appropriate method of wheat sowing after rice harvesting in the state of Haryana. Three techniques are used: the conventional technique and the super seeder, was taken for the study. The authors prove that the super seeder seems to be the most economically profitable approach.</p> <p>Here are my observations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 'Super seeder was revealed to be the most economical approach for handling paddy straw without burning it before sowing wheat crops'. I did not quite understand what exactly the authors mean in this sentence of the abstract. 2) Can you please specify the methodology of the thematic approach or how you intend to approach the study after setting the objective at the end of the introduction? 3) The methodology part is briefly addressed by the authors, which does not make it possible to establish the scientific link between the methodologies adopted and the results found. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Can the authors present respectively the variables depending on and independent of their study while justifying the choice of these? 4.2 Can you please explain clearly the method that led to the results of this study, the relevance of which remains a reality? 4.3 Can the authors present the simplifying assumptions that frame this study? Can we believe that the study took place in the laboratory under the same experimental conditions or in different places with consideration of minimized deviations? 4.4 Can we have the operational method of each technique experienced? 4) Many abbreviations are misused in the text. The authors should clarify this breach. 5) Why does Table 2 appear before Table 1 in the analysis of the results? 6) The authors seem to put more seriousness to the raw presentation of the results without a real critical and explanatory analysis of the observed realities. 7) The results presented are dense, which has the advantage of gleaning a large flow of information at the end of the study. This approach has a criticizable side because it no longer makes it possible to find important information. The authors would benefit from presenting meaningful results and removing subsidiary information; 8) The conclusion should be improved <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8.1 In the conclusion, can you present your critical view of the methodology adopted to solve the problem of this study? 8.2 8.2 Can you discuss your results and identify relevant perspectives? How can this study be improved? 	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Merlin Zacharie Ayissi
Department, University & Country	University of Douala, Cameroon