

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101954
Title of the Manuscript:	On-Farm Study on the Efficacy of Weed Management Treatments on Wheat under Irrigated Agro-Ecosystem of Jharkhand
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The presentation is terrible, and the language is a mishmash of weak sentences. Their conclusion and abstract were both written incomprehensibly (lengthy and overly detailed). The authors were unable to respond appropriately to the original study's core question by covering critical subtopics. In the results and discussion section, the author listed all the titles and their findings but did not discuss each issue separately. I couldn't find any organization or clear explanation because everything was in disarray. As a result, I cannot accept the work in its current form because it lacks scientific value for readers.</p> <p>Several verbs and sentences have been used more than once. The references in your introduction are insufficient. You give a long, confusing explanation. Did you involve methodology in your results? Why?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute, City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt