

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102766
Title of the Manuscript:	“Yield and economics of Maize (Zea mays L.) hybrids under agro-climatic conditions of Prayagraj, U.P.”
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 „**lac k of N o v elty**“, 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>This research is good research that Studies on Yield and economics of Maize (Zea mays L.) hybrids under agro-climatic conditions of Prayagraj, U.P</p> <p>Technique And the title is suitable and ok</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>manuscript is scientifically correct</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is not bad and suitable for scholarly but The words in yellow should be rewritten again.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Research experiments are supposed to be in minimum two seasons</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:	Mohamed Ibrahim El-Meadawy
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Engineering Research Institute, Egypt