

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_106034 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Optimizing Nursery Trays for minimizing Seedlings per pick of Transplanter in SRI |
| 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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The research is one of the good researches in this field, and the appropriate research and analytical method was used, and the results were consistent with economic theory and statistically correct, so the research is good and does not contain scientific, statistical or spelling errors, but I advise the researcher to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research is very good and one of the good researches in this field. Use the experiment and extract its results in an excellent scientific way. The research is valid for publication without making any modifications to it, and if possible, if the researcher reviews the results more, as the research is important and has good results that can be explained better. - The rest of the research contents are excellent and there are no errors in either the research method or the logical review of the results | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Sarhan Ahmed Soliman |
| Department, University & Country | Agriculture Economy Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt |