

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100944
Title of the Manuscript:	Intercropping of Chilli with Carrot and Radish in Prayagraj Agro-climatic Conditions
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>The manuscript is important for scientific community because intercropping is a major farming system method that plays a significant role in increasing productivity stability of yield.</p> <p>Suggestion: Intercropping Chili with Carrot and Radish under Prayagraj Agroclimatic Conditions</p> <p>With some modifications</p> <p>Needs modification Yes, but needs some modifications</p> <p>The references are NOT sufficient and majority are not current. The citation style is different in the manuscript.</p> <p>1. Abstract: There have been some modifications in the abstract. So, I am adding the main manuscript to review's comments to address it.</p> <p>2. Several sentences from the literature are used by the authors in the introduction without citation.</p> <p>3. The statement " The production of resources has risen thanks to the intercropping strategy." This statement should be reconstructed.</p> <p>4. "and more profitable than sole cropping thanks to the complementary effects of intercropping". This statement should be reconstructed.</p> <p>5. The objective is too long... it should be divided into two or three parts for more clarity.</p> <p>5. The following acronyms are not defined, such as DAP, MOP, RDF, etc.</p> <p>6. The experimental site is not properly described</p> <p>7. Data collection must be correctly stated with all indexes</p> <p>8. You must first clearly explain your results, the significance of the treatments, before discussing the results and relating the results to other findings, whether they support them or not.</p> <p>9. Maximum root girth (24.09 cm) ... Please check if this is a carrot and if this is correct.</p> <p>10. For growth, yield and quality parameters, sole cropping pattern of each crop showed the best result, but when it comes to overall yield, intercropping showed maximum result. Please explain this in more detail...</p> <p>11. The reference "Soniya et al, ()" ... Please add the year.</p> <p>12. What kind of reference style did you use? Numbering or what? Example, Innazent et al [9] and another form, Alom et al (2008). Both are used in your manuscript. Please stick to one form.</p> <p>13. Your subtitle should be constructed correctly. (e.g., Yield quality characters of carrots). Should be rephrase</p> <p>14. The tables should be reconstructed without too many lines. This is not scientific enough.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language could be improved but NOT a major problem</p> <p>2. How did you measure the significant effect of intercropping on growth and yield of chili?</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Richard Dormatey
Department, University & Country	CSIR, Crops Research Institute, Ghana