

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_97324</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Effect of levels of micro nutrients and Naphthalene Acetic Acid on growth ,yield and economics of summer green gram (Vigna radiata L.)”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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>	1. I suggest the authors to include more cites of researchers in the field related to micronutrients and naphthalene acetic acid composition effects on growth and yield of plants and comparing that research with their discussion performed in their study. I strongly recommend the review of different literature scientific research. 2. Moreover, I think the authors must expand their introduction, discussion, and conclusion sections accordingly with new literature review that might strengthen their investigation. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes 7. Yes, although I suggest the authors to cite more articles to strengthen their findings.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	None. I think the manuscript is well written and has not typo or redaction errors.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I suggest the authors cite more articles related with the methodology they performed; and latter get a better understanding of the conclusions they found in their manuscript, discussing them with more details.	

### 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>Jorge Octavio Virues Delgadillo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Veracruzana, México</b>