

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97524
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SOIL APPLICATION OF ZINC AND FOLIAR APPLICATION OF BORON ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF MAIZE (ZEA MAYS 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><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. Talking about the maize crop, the article is extremely important for the scientific community worldwide.</p> <p>2. The title is correct for the proposed subject.</p> <p>3. Please add the aim of the paper. The last phrase is 8 rows long and has no meaning, mentioning twice that T9 (Zinc 15 kg/ha + Boron 1.5%) is best version – please simplify it.</p> <p>4. Correct structure and subsections.</p> <p>5. According to the figures, the manuscript seems to be correct.</p> <p>6. Quite recent references, but not sufficient. Please add 4-5 recent papers, preferably in Introduction, since more than half of them are cited in Results, as comparisons. Also, the writing style in References is not uniform, with differences between papers – check and correct.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Read again the entire paper and correct it – some phrases have more verbs than necessary, wrong words, missing or additional spaces, a lot of words having first capital letter (why?).</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Some of the words are written in grey, instead of black. Poor Conclusion and wrong written. Use `T` for treatments all over the paper, if you mentioned them like that in Methods. Correct that also in tables.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Horoias Roxana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</b>