

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_107629
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Weed Management Practices on Growth Characters of Mungbean under Mid-hills of Himachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pulses, owing to their leguminous nature, are considered to be important components of cropping systems because of their viability to fix atmospheric nitrogen, add significant amounts of organic matter to the soil and produce reasonable yields with low inputs under harsh climatic and soil conditions has been evidenced from the previous findings. • The management of weed infestation in pulses crop has the potential to rise their yields and N fixation yields. • The study has chronicled that Mungbean is an important grain legume crop that is mainly grown in arid and semi-arid regions and serves an imperative role towards achieving improved human nutrition and health conditions, dipping poverty through food security and enhancing ecosystem resilience as a source of human food, animal feed, soil nitrogen and soil health. • Yes, the title of the manuscript is appropriate enough. • Yes, the abstract written is comprehensive. • Yes, they are appropriate enough addressing various significant aspects. • Yes, they are appropriate enough inscribing various significant aspects. • The presentation of the Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion are rather noticeable. • In addition, the observations were subjected to statistical analysis that has been concisely documented in Tabular forms in a persuasive method. • It has been stated that weeding and hoeing are common cultural and manual weed management methods for Greengram. • Therefore, a sensible combination of chemical and cultural methods of weed control would not only lessen the expenditure on herbicides but would be profitable to the crop by providing proper aeration and conservation of moisture. • Nevertheless, in pulses, it is advantageous to know the effect of herbicides on symbiotic parameters also such as nodule number, nodule dry weight and leghaemoglobin content in nodules, that accounts the measure of nitrogen fixing ability of the plant. • The references cited are adequate and recent enough. 	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract, 3rd line: growth characteristics- replace the word. Pg. no.2, 6th line: 15% of consumption- insert a preposition. Pg. no.2, 12th line: the area; 13th line: weeds of the mungbean. Pg. no.2, 3rd paragraph, 4th line: plays an important role in achieving- insert an article and change preposition. The usage of the English language is appropriate and aptly suitable for scholarly communications. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the data were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) as per the standard procedures. The comparison of treatment means was made by critical difference (RBD) at $p=0.05$. Overall, the manuscript has been succinctly described and well-presented with related statistical data that has been documented in the form of fine Tabular forms. 	

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:	Asma Jabeen
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Rice Research, Osmania University, India