

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100446
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Sulphur and Spacing on Growth and Yield of Toria (Brassica campestris 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>)

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It seems to me that the manuscript is important for the scientific community since it tries to establish the relationship between Influence of Sulphur and Spacing on Growth and Yield of Toria.</p> <p>2. The title is adequate</p> <p>3. The summary shows the basic elements of the investigation, or what the summary is pertinent, although it could be improved.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is adequate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the reading is difficult, it would be necessary to make an effort to give it a better writing, making the reading more fluent</p> <p>6. The references are not enough; it could be expanded by doing a more exhaustive bibliographic search and this will enrich the document. Most references are more than 10 years old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The wording of the article is not very clear, difficult to read. So it is recommended to make a better writing of the writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The description of the groups with sulphure-spacing combinations is not correct in materials and methods. In the tables at the end of the document if the description is correct. The groups in the materials and method section will have to be corrected.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Universidad De Guadalajara, Mexico