

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101371
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Biofertilizers and Foliar application of Zinc on Yield and Economics of Lentil (<i>Lens culinaris</i> L.)
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"> 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. Title is suitable for the article. 3. Abstract is comprehensive but need to improve 4. Subsection and structure is appropriate. 5. Manuscript is scientifically doubt of correctness. 6. Reference is not sufficient more reference may be sited <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Author has more scope to improve the result and discussion section. b. More reference may be sited more justification is needed to establishment the recommendation. c. Material and methods are not satisfactory. Protocol is not mentioned as indicated by green marking. d. Author did not mentioned the amount of biofertilizer applied in the field. e. author planted five plant randomly. So, unit may be yield gram/plant. But author measured it kg/htr. How it isconverted? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Language is communicable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	revision is necessary specifically in material and method for scientific justification.	

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:	Dharmeswar Barman
Department, University & Country	Goalpara College, Gauhati University, India