

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101024
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of cropping system and Nutrient Management Practices on the Yield, and Economics of Pearl Millet [Pennisetum glaucum]
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes Ok Yes, Easy to understand full manuscript by abstract Writing material and structure of all the subsections are good Scientifically correct but data recorded related to yield is not fair because of yield in intercropping treatments should be less than sole treatment (due to row ratio) which is totally incorrect and supported reference also not support yield data. References are sufficient and recent but most of journal which has not NAAS rated should be removed because of reliability of supported references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hari Singh
Department, University & Country	Krishi Vigyan Kendra, India