

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95757
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth indices of Bt and non Bt high density planted cotton as influenced by integrated nutrient management practices
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>1. In the article under review, the research question is valid. The abstract is an accurate summary of the research and results. In the introduction, the previous studies by other researchers have been discussed convincingly. The description of the design and methods is appropriate to answer the research question. The reporting of the Materials and Methods is sufficiently detailed to reproduce the research. The tables are clear and accurately represent the analysis/results. There are appropriate citations supporting the claim being made.</p> <p>2. Yes. The article title is suitable and truly represents the contents.</p> <p>3. The abstract is an accurate summary of the research and results.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient in number and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article has several grammatical mistakes Grammatical errors may kindly be removed by the author before the paper is accepted for publication. At many places in the text of the research paper, articles such as 'a', 'an', and 'the' are missing. At some places, an appropriate form of a proposition is needed to replace the wrong form of the proposition being used.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract of the paper is concise. The content of the paper is good. The reported results are well explained. Materials and Methods are adequate. Conclusions describe the findings in a nutshell. References are relevant.</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:	Devinder Pal Singh
Department, University & Country	Acoustics Research Center, Canada