

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_107399</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“EFFECT OF MULCH AND DIFFERENT TILLAGE PRACTICES ON YIELD &amp; YIELD ATTRIBUTING CHARACTERS OF SORGHUM CROP”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1.The manuscript important for the scientific community and dry land farming.</p> <p>2. Effect of mulching and tillage practices on yield and yield attributes of <i>Sorghum</i> (Scientific name) at Nandyal</p> <p>3. Abstract lack composition, proper grammar, and coherency of expressions.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>7. Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language of expressions and coherences of statements need to be improved. The author didn't used proper tenses, and not sounding voices of expressions in literature review, and result and discussion</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The experiment conducted for three years, but the data collected and interpretation of the result is not well done. The author presented the variables which are not presented in material and methods section. The material and methods sections did not present the procedure adopted and practices applied properly. The treatment and variables presented not clear. How the treatments were combined and laid out need rewriting.</p> <p>The background statement lack proper flow of presenting about the crop and limitation and works done before. No supporting literatures presented to strengthen the problem.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adare, Zenebe Mekonnen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Arba Minch University, Ethiopia</b>