

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100892
Title of the Manuscript:	Inter Cropping of Chilli with Coriander and Fenugreek in Prayagraj Agro-climatic Conditions.
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes. The paper is scientific research that helps farmers and other researchers to have a better conception of intercropping.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes. The title describes the experiment well.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Abstract needs more work while not reflecting the right information about treatments.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Results and table need more work. There is no ANOVA reference and table captions are not proper. If tables are showing the mean comparison of measured variables, they should be captioned above clearly. There are some mistyping and errors as well.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, however, needs some clarifications in abbreviations and results.</b></p> <p>6. <b>This part is Ok.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes. It is acceptable.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The paper needs to be revised in the Abstract, tables and results, and discussion.	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maral Etesami</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Montana State University, USA</b>