

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103822
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Spacing and Nitrogen on Growth and Yield of Kharif Sweetcorn (Zea mays L. saccharata)
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 it is important because of current material is plays an important role as a food product globally. Authors are approximately reaches towards their objective but in next level certainly this work will reach to next level.</p> <p>Yes the title of the article is appropriately suitable.</p> <p>Yes the abstract of the article is not appropriate comprehensive.</p> <p>No need to change.</p> <p>Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>No, references are not sufficient and try to add some recent ones.</p> <p>Author should rewrite the conclusion section entirely. Author should add more discussion in result and discussion section related to their work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Author may add the digital images in the manuscript. Author may add the more supportive results.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashish Wamanrao Selokar
Department, University & Country	Mohsinbhai Zaveri Mahavidyalaya, India