

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_109301</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimization of sowing window for Bt Cotton using DSSAT Seasonal Analysis Tool in Nagarkurnool district of Telangana State</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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 REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important to the scientific community?</b> The theme of the manuscript is certainly relevant, however it needs improvements in writing.</li> <li>2. <b>Is the article title appropriate?</b> I believe that the title can be improved, mainly to be more succinct in relation to what was done. As a suggestion: Computational model for predicting cotton sowing time in Nagarkurnool district of Telangana State</li> <li>3. <b>Is the article summary comprehensive?</b> could be improved</li> <li>4. <b>Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript adequate?</b> Yes</li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> Partially, there was a lack of scientific basis to support the results.</li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> This is one of the main negative points of this manuscript. There was a lack of scientific basis based on current scientific literature</li> </ol> <p><b>Some suggestions to improve the manuscript presentation:</b></p> <p><b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> I suggest that the references be updated in the Introduction of the manuscript and that the seasonal importance for cotton productivity be clarified. It would be important to review the quality of the English by a native speaker throughout the manuscript.</p> <p><b>2. MATERIAL AND METHODS</b> This section could further clarify the application of forecasting models to determine the ideal cotton sowing date. This section was exaggeratedly succinct, lacking a more detailed description of the cultivation site and the environmental and soil characteristics in which the experiment was set up. What was the spacing and arrangement between the plants? What was the environment like throughout the cotton germination cycle? These environmental and soil variables must be the same in all treatments. Was it missing to describe what "mandals" would be? This word appears many times but it is not clear what exactly it means. How was 32 years of meteorological data used? clarify further the application of this database. Describe in detail all the variables you studied and how the results were analyzed. The manuscript is not at all clear in this aspect. I suggest rearranging the methodology in the same order that the results will appear in the following section "results and discussion". It is also necessary to detail the data processing procedure before applying the Tukey test. Was a normality test performed? How was the variance? F test results etc.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p><b>3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>                  In this section, many results discussed were not described in the methodology. It needs a general reorganization in this part of the manuscript, as the data is not discussed adequately. It is necessary for authors to compare their findings with other works in the literature. This was not brought up in the discussion. Incomplete section as it does not bring other results to the light of discussion and validation of the experiment.</p> <p><b>4. CONCLUSION</b>                  This section of the manuscript does not meet a scientific article standard. Since the findings of this research, even though they seemed relevant, were not adequately discussed. The conclusion was not able to meet the objective of this research. The manuscript needs a general restructuring and reorganization with a more robust reference through solid and recent research on cotton farming.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>An in-depth review is required of the quality of the English language throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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><b>Aldir Carpes Marques Filho</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Federal University of Lavras, Brazil</b></p>