

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100369
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of different irrigation techniques on wheat crop micro-climate
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This work is important to the scientific community. However, there are deficiencies in the content and some parts of the article. First of all, article writing should be handled in a scientific language. Likewise, the findings should be adequately discussed with the literature findings. When these deficiencies are completed, it will contribute more to science.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract section should be written in journal format. The materials and methods, findings and recommendations in the abstract should be reconsidered in journal format and in the form of an article summary.</p> <p>4. Subsections of the article were not written in journal format. Especially the introduction part should be handled with the literature in line with the purpose of the research. The introduction should be revised.</p> <p>5. I think the article is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The literature on the subject of the study is insufficient. More literature on the subject should be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article should be written in accordance with scientific communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The subject of the article is original. It will contribute to scientific studies. However, The article can be published after the above mentioned deficiencies are completed.</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:	Celal Cevher
Department, University & Country	Field Crops Central Researcher Institute, Turkey