

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_107651
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of herbicide on root nodules, phytotoxicity and economics of chickpea
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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"> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly for researchers and practitioners in the field of agronomy and crop science. The study investigates the effects of different herbicides on chickpea growth, nodulation, and economic returns, addressing a practical concern in agricultural management. The findings contribute valuable insights into weed management practices for chickpea cultivation, which is significant given the economic importance of chickpea as a pulse crop. Additionally, the study provides information on phytotoxicity, growth parameters, and economic considerations, offering a comprehensive analysis that can guide farmers and researchers in making informed decisions about herbicide use in chickpea farming. Overall, the manuscript's focus on a relevant agricultural issue and its systematic approach to experimentation make it a meaningful contribution to the scientific community. The title of the article, "Effect of Herbicide on Root Nodules, Phytotoxicity, and Economics of Chickpea," is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. However, for enhanced clarity and conciseness, you may consider a slight modification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested Alternative Title: "Herbicide Impact on Chickpea: Nodule Development, Phytotoxicity, and Economic Insights" The abstract of the article provides a brief overview of the study, covering the key elements such as the objective, location of the experiment, main findings, and some critical parameters measured. <p>Suggestions for Enhancement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight Key Results - Specify a few of the most significant results in terms of herbicide impact on chickpea growth, nodulation, and economics. Include Implications. Mention any practical implications or applications of the findings for farmers or the agricultural community. Incorporate a Concluding Statement. End the abstract with a concise concluding statement summarizing the overall significance or contribution of the study. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript generally follows a conventional structure with sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, it appears that there might be some issues with the subsections and the structure in the provided text. The Materials and Methods section is mentioned, but specific subsections within this section are not outlined. Typically, this section would include subsections such as Experimental Design, Treatments, Data Collection, and Statistical Analysis. While it's mentioned in the structure, the actual separation between results and discussion is not clearly delineated in the provided text. The language and structure could be refined to enhance clarity. Each subsection should have a clear focus and contribute to the overall flow of the manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are instances of grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and typos throughout the manuscript. To enhance the overall quality of the language, consider submitting it to technical proofreader to enhance the overall quality of the paper.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript explores an important aspect of agronomy, investigating the impact of herbicides on chickpea growth, nodulation, and economic returns. The study is valuable for the scientific community, addressing practical challenges in weed management in chickpea cultivation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider incorporating graphical elements such as charts or tables to visually present key findings. Visual aids can enhance the clarity and accessibility of the data. • Ensure that in-text citations are consistently formatted according to a specific style guide (e.g., APA, MLA). • Explicitly link the results presented in the "Results and Discussion" section back to the stated objectives in the introduction. This reinforces the study's purpose and significance. • Confirm that the manuscript adheres to the specific guidelines of the intended journal. Journal guidelines often provide specific requirements for formatting, referencing, and overall structure. • A final round of proofreading is recommended to catch any remaining grammatical errors, typos, or inconsistencies. • Strike a balance between providing sufficient detail for clarity and avoiding excessive detail that may distract from the main points. Focus on what is most essential for readers to understand and interpret the results. 	
---	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Gene T. Señeris</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Aklan State University, Philippines</p>