

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100277
Title of the Manuscript:	"Influence of Microbial inoculants and Molybdenum on Yield and Economics of Chickpea (Cicer arietinum 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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is very important to the chickpea and pulse growing farming community which indicates the importance of microbial inoculants and also micronutrients which are low cost inputs that gain more profound effect on crop production.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract was very comprehensive and clearly summarised</p> <p>All the subsections and structure of manuscript were good, but need to include some corrections made by reviewer (mentioned in the appropriate places of manuscript)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The reference are well sufficient and recent. But there is need to add some more references to support the research. GOI 2020-2021 is missing and include it in references</p> <p>The research work in manuscript was very good. But the author should improve the scientific writing skills of articles and research papers.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The manuscript had so many dramatic mistakes and there is no proper sentence formation in the body of manuscript. As a reviewer i strongly suggesting the author to improve scientific writing skills of research papers.	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. Ramanjineyulu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sri Krishnadevaraya College of Horticultural Sciences, India</b>