

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_105354</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Zinc and Sulphur recommendations over farmer practices for bridging technological gap in paddy crop in Central India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is beneficial for the scientific community. But this manuscript requires major corrections. Wording /language needs refinement.</p> <p>2. Title should also be modified. It may be like this “ <b>Impact assessment of Zinc and Sulphur application through front line demonstrations in paddy in tribal region of Central India</b>”</p> <p>3. <b>Yes, but still needs improvement</b> RD – Abbreviation is not suitable here. Write it with detail first and then abbreviation can be used. Also mention the area whether it is per hectare or somewhat else</p> <p>4. <b>Yes. Economics (Gross return, Net return and B:C ratio) should also be calculated.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Interpretation of results needs revision</b></p> <p>6. References mentioned at Sr. No.,6,15 and 27 are missing in the paper</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Wording /language needs major revision/refinement.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1.No. of demonstrations (13) is very less. For more authenticity, the results of more no. of demonstrations should be taken into account.</p> <p>2. Graphic representation of the results will be more effective.</p> <p>3. Keep the units of Zn and S uptake same everywhere whether <math>g\ ha^{-1}</math> or <math>Kg\ ha^{-1}</math></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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Satwinderjit Kaur</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Punjab Agricultural University, India</b>