

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_97027</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of different irrigation scheduling and nutrient management practices on yield and economics of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)</b>
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>The hole study deals only about wheat so, the title of he article can be modified as "Impacts of different irrigation schedules and nutrients managent practices on economics of wheat"</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> 1. <b>Given abbreviations are not explained. So, author has to check it explain.</b> 2. <b>The research gap given at the end of introduction is not clearly fulfilled in findings. Author has to check it and make it a clear fulfillment.</b> 3. <b>Author has not referred and cited about Table No.3. So, the explanation for the table should be given.</b> 4. <b>Conclusion should be end up with how the study developed to research findings. But, conclusion is lacks in this. So, author has to rectify it.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>T. Amose</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Madurai Kamaraj University, India</b>