

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101130
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of integrated weed management practices on growth, physiology and yield of direct sown finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</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> <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>Finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i>) is an essential crop for dry land because it is hardy and can survive in different weather conditions. It is usually grown in soils that don't have much water or nutrients. Also, the crop significantly affects the world's poor in terms of food security, and it gives millions of people energy and protein.</p> <p>There is nothing wrong with the title.</p> <p>Even though some of the sentences in this manuscript's abstract might be unclear or hard to follow, the presentation of the abstract as a whole is satisfactory in its entirety.</p> <p>Inadequate work has been done on that section of the literature review.</p> <p>The scientific aspects of this manuscript are satisfactory.</p> <p>Each of the references should pertain to the most recent five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English language is satisfactory, although there are some sentences that do not adhere to proper grammar. There are some sentences that might not be clear or might be difficult to understand.</p>	
<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:	Supparang Ruangvanich
Department, University & Country	Chandrakasem Rajabhat University, Thailand