

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJECC_106324</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Efficacy of early foliar spray intervention on alteration of physiological efficiencies and seed quality attributes of green gram (Vigna radiata L.)</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>  |

### 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Good article for publication. However, there are still some fundamental concerns with the experimental design and, most critically, with the analysis. This means the strong conclusions put forward by this manuscript are not warranted and need more explanations. For example, authors can improve precision of measured values by adding SD (standard deviation ) determine the range, or difference, between the lowest and the highest measured values.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>  | <p>Should be more synthesised and add references for figures.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   |   |   |

### 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><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>Nsangou Nchare Abdoulaye</b>        |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University Paris Saclay, France</b> |