

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104048
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of screen aperture size for grading of dhaincha
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, particularly to formalize and standardize opening hole size for dhaincha material ➤ The title of the manuscript/article is suitable and can be considered as best fit title ➤ Abstract part of the paper is more of precise and comprehensive, except background part (rationale of the study has to be justified) ➤ Yes, sub-sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate according to my observations ➤ The manuscript is scientifically acceptable and meaningful ➤ The references for this paper are more or less sufficient but try to incorporate recently promoted or published references to make more updated 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For scholarly communications, the quality of English language throughout the manuscript is very good and can be understandable by any person around the scientific community 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None 	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zeru Yimer Kebede
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia