

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100486
Title of the Manuscript:	“Effect of Nitrogen and Plant growth Regulator on Yield and Economics of Wheat (Triticum aestivum 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> <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. The effect of plant inputs on the yield have been studied. The manuscript fulfils the requirement but it can be made better by including the suggested correction.</p> <p>The title is precise.</p> <p>The abstract was written neatly with all the information giving a clear picture of the research.</p> <p>Structure of the manuscript is good but results can be elaborated more by including graphs and comparing with traditional wheat practices. Include graphs in the results section. Include table for treatments in the M&M section. Check manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct. Compare with traditional wheat practice to show the increase in yield and income.</p> <p>References are sufficient but follow the guidelines. Few references mentioned in the text are missing in the reference section. General Guideline for Authors (peerreviewcentral.com)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Quality and terminology are up to the mark.	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S Sai Mohan
Department, University & Country	Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, India