

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99940</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PERFORMANCE OF VARIETIES UNDER DIFFERENT NITROGEN FERTILIZER LEVELS</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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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. Nitrogen percentage regulates plant growth and affect negatively/positively the yield. The scientific community need to know the performance of plants under different levels of nitrogen applied to the soil. This is in an effort to increase the yield to fight hunger in the communities through food sufficiency.</p> <p>2. Suitable</p> <p>3. The researcher need to Re-write with cohesion. The conclusion is not convincing. Also to Include a brief background in your first sentence.</p> <p>4. Correct</p> <p>5. Correct, though it needs revisions. The abstract needs re do, the methodology seems hurried, expand it. The trials need to increase from 4 to 6 or more, for a favorable conclusion on the graphs. 4 points are inconclusive. The meaning of the findings need to stated clearly to convince the readers</p> <p>6. Insufficient references, 6 only on 8 pages are not enough. Refer to all work extracted or cited</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The researcher/s need to have more than 4 trials per batch, to have a better conclusion	

### 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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shumba Tobias Takawira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Harare Polytechnic, Zimbabwe</b>