

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103827
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of DSSAT-CROPGRO module for spatial yield estimation of Chickpea in Vidisha (Madhya Pradesh) and Nagaur (Rajasthan)
Type of the 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>I consider that it is convenient to point out the intention and the effort that the authors make in wanting to make the manuscript and bring an experience to a research product, that is certainly valuable and recognized. I think it would be an interesting model to improve and clearly establish originality.</p> <p>Your work is interesting, written well, and organized. However, there are some comments that should be considered before publishing, in this way, the scientific quality of the manuscript would be improved.</p> <p>I suggest the authors update the bibliography, many of the citations are more than 15 years old, therefore I suggest adding recent references which address the issue in question. Suggested citations are for genuine scientific reasons that emphasize the current topic of study in context.</p> <p>Authors should consider the corrections suggested by the reviewers. In this way the postulated manuscript would be reasonably presented, fluent reading.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<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:	Barlin Orlando Olivares
Department, University & Country	University of Cordoba, Spain

Review Form 1.7