

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100987
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Mulch and Irrigation Schedules on Yield and Quality of Spring Sunflower in Tarai Region of Northern India
Type of the Article	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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes the title is suitable</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract needs corrections. It is not written very scientifically.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>The author has not written the Result and Discussion scientifically. It need to be re written. The Table Number is not mentioned. Even the data is not mentioned in the manuscript. The discussion part is written very poorly. The interaction Table is missing.</b></p> <p>6. <b>No the references are very old and not enough. It needs to be revised.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The language is not upto the mark. Synonym of several words are used which is not suitable technically. That needs to be changed.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The manuscript needs lots of corrections. This paper should be accepted only after all these corrections.	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Reena Nair</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidhayala, India</b>