

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJECC_100783</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Studies on Growth and Yield of Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) var. as influenced by Potassium and Zinc</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments<br><br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | I would like to thank the authors for a very interesting research topic, but I would like to make some corrections in order to improve the quality of the manuscript.<br><br>The title is clear and indicates the entire research. The abstract contains all the necessary elements.<br><br>I would suggest that the review of literature be strengthened, so that the slots will insert literature related to similar problems and researches for each of the variables they investigated.<br><br>The methodology is explained precisely. |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | yes  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Zugravu Consatanta Laura</b>                       |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University "Dunarea de Jos" of Galati, Romania</b> |