

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96868
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sulphur and Zinc on Growth, Yield and quality of Summer Green gram
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The subject of this manuscript is very important especially for those who work in the field of reclaimed and/or poor land for obtaining good quality and quantity products</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but it is very concise</p> <p>No, because the obtained results expressed only one season, but at least it should be for two years or a comparison with other seasons in the same year.</p> <p>No, the references is not sufficient and about half of them are not mentioned in the text, in addition, references must be numbered in the text according to their mention as the journal policy. Please back to the attached file " Reviewer Comments " for more details.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Relatively to some extent	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The field experiment was carried out for one season only. 2- Five references out of ten (all references) are not found in the body text, while other is not found in the reference list. 3- References must be numbered as they first mention in the text and in the reference list as the journal policy. 4- The aim of work is missing. 5- The discussion is very poor and short. 6- Tables must be reconstructed as shown in the comments. 7- Consequently, the discussion of the obtained results will change after construction of the tables in the right manner. 8- The author did not mention the method used to discriminate between treatments means, i.e., LSD, Duncan's Multiple Range Test, or other method. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Ahmed Gesraha
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt