

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97090
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Sprinkler Irrigation, Fertility Levels and Bio-regulator on Productivity and Water Use Efficiency of Zaid Mungbean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.)
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community as it presents findings of a three-year experiment on mungbean, which is an important crop in many regions. These findings may be useful for farmers and researchers working on mungbean cultivation and related crops. Yes, the title of the article seems suitable. The title clearly states the main focus of the article, which is to evaluate the performance of sprinkler irrigation, fertility levels, and bio-regulator on the productivity and water use efficiency of Zaid Mungbean. The title provides enough information for readers to understand the main objective of the study and what they can expect to learn from reading the article. The abstract of the article provides a good summary of the key findings of the study. It provides information on the experimental design and the treatment combinations that were used. The abstract also presents the main results of the study, including the maximum grain yield, water use efficiency, and net return, and the treatment combinations that were found to be superior. However, it could be improved by including some additional information. For example, the abstract could mention the significance of the findings, such as how they contribute to the understanding of mungbean cultivation and the potential impact on agricultural practices. It could also include some details on the methodology used in the study, such as the specific techniques used for irrigation and fertilization. This would provide readers with a better understanding of the study and its implications. Additionally, the abstract could be structured in a more concise and clear way to make it easier to read and understand. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate and follow a standard format for a research article. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The title is clear and concise, and accurately reflects the focus of the study. -The abstract provides a brief summary of the study and its key findings. -The introduction presents the background and context of the study, including a review of relevant literature and the rationale for the research. -The materials and methods section describes the experimental design, including the treatment combinations and the methods used for data collection and analysis. -The results and discussion section presents the main findings of the study and discusses their implications, as well as any limitations or future directions for research. -The conclusion summarizes the main findings and their significance and provides recommendations for future research. -The references section lists the sources cited in the manuscript and follows a standard format. Overall, the manuscript structure and subsections appear to be appropriate for a research article and provide a clear and organized presentation of the study. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The study conducted experiments over three consecutive years and used appropriate statistical analysis to evaluate the effects of different irrigation regimes, fertility levels, and bio-regulators on the productivity and water use efficiency of zaid mungbean. The conclusions drawn from the results are reasonable and based on the data collected. It is difficult to determine if the references are sufficient and recent without knowing the specific requirements of the task at hand. However, it appears that some of the references are relatively old, such as reference 1 from 2004 and reference 10 from 1984, which may not be ideal if the aim is to provide the most up-to-date information on the topic. On the other hand, there are more recent references, such as reference 12 from 2020 and reference 15 from 2018. It is also worth noting that the references cover a range of topics related to mungbean, including irrigation, nutrient management, and plant growth, which may provide a comprehensive overview of the current knowledge on the subject. Ultimately, the adequacy of the references will depend on the specific requirements of the task and the depth and breadth of the literature review. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The language quality of the article is generally acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are some minor issues that could be improved. First, there are some grammatical errors, such as missing articles (e.g., "a typically warm season 	

Review Form 1.7

communications?	crop," "an important practice") and incorrect verb tenses (e.g., "Indian farmers covered" should be "Indian farmers covered"). Second, there are some unclear phrases and sentences that could benefit from rephrasing or further explanation. For example, it's not clear what "judicious application" means in the sentence "Irrigation water is the limiting and costly input in zaid season and it is judicious application need special attention for the maximizing yield." Lastly, the article would benefit from more precise and consistent terminology. For instance, the crop is referred to as both "mungbean" and "green gram," and the term "thiosalicylic acid" is used without explanation, while later in the article it is referred to as "salicylic acid." Overall, while there are some language issues that could be improved, the content and structure of the article appear suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	No additional 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Galván Ruiz
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Queretaro, Mexico