

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99849
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Herbicides on Weed Control & Growth Parameter on Wheat
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> <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>1. The manuscript is scientifically important and relevant</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate</p> <p>3. The abstract is elaborate enough to cover the entire article</p> <p>4. The manuscript is not well structured scientifically. The author should strictly follow the structure template.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound</p> <p>6. The references are recent, though they are few. More references should be added, 15 – 20 approximately.</p> <p>In addition;</p> <p>1. The entire document should be well punctuated. Consider all the spacing after punctuation marks.</p> <p>2. The headings and subheadings should not be underlined. Bold is enough.</p> <p>3. Where is the 'Materials and Methods' section? When was the study conducted and where?</p> <p>4. Which method of data analysis was used to analyse the data?</p> <p>5. The conclusion needs more spacing by proper paragraphing.</p> <p>6. All the References should be numbered and a falling indent format of paragraphing used.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language is okay</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:	Bryan Okoth Omondi
Department, University & Country	University of Eldoret, Kenya