

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105603
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SEED TREATMENT WITH BIOINOCULANTS ON SEED YIELD AND QUALITY PARAMETERS IN CHICKPEA (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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"> 1. An interesting research has been taken forward in the Agriculture domain by Authors. Seed treatment contributes significantly in the yield of crops. More data to be required for the effective implementation of research. 2. The term "Seed yield" is confusion and misleading the entire title. The respective term can be replaced with suitable terms. 3. The title of the research reflecting as it is in the abstract that has to be removed. Abstract has too much data. Instead of the data, provide more inference abstractly. 4. Headings and subsections are to be aligned properly with appropriate numbering. 5. The purpose of the current research has to be reflected clearly at the end of the Introduction. Objective as separate heading is not required. Limited information only observed in the "Materials and Methods" Pre and Post harvest parts can be presented with more clarity instead just exhibiting the data. More references can be witnessed in the 'Discussion' part. Keep them limited and exhibit more inferences from the current research. The explanations on Table 1 to 4 are missing. In the context of results & discussion, limited points only present in the conclusion. Include further research explorations from the data of the present work. 6. Reference section to be modified and arrange it in proper order. Follow a standard format. More relevant references have to be included. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>In the text there are errors in English, need to be carefully read and corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The entire manuscript to be aligned properly.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. Sankaranarayanan
Department, University & Country	Mepco Schlenk Engineering College, India