

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118651
Title of the Manuscript:	Nipping and foliar spray for enhanced seed yield in Horsegram var. Paiyur 2
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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is significant for the scientific community, especially for agronomists and researchers focused on legume crops. It addresses the underutilized horse gram, providing insights into improving its yield through nipping and foliar application of growth regulators, which can help enhance productivity in rainfed and marginal areas, contributing to food security and sustainable agriculture. The current title is descriptive and suits the content of the article. The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the study's purpose, methods, and key findings effectively. It highlights the increase in plant height, branches, number of pods, and yield due to the combined treatment of nipping and foliar spray, making it informative and concise. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. It follows a logical flow with clear sections that are essential for scientific reporting. However, the data analysis section should be expanded upon and made into another paragraph separate from the experimental procedures. The manuscript appears scientifically correct. The experiments are well-designed, and the conclusions drawn are supported by the results presented. The references are sufficient and include both recent and relevant sources. However, the citation format is not consistent and requires revision. Additional references could include more recent studies on foliar application techniques and plant growth regulators to strengthen the literature review. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical and typographical errors should be corrected to enhance readability and professionalism. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally acceptable for scientific publishing. However, minor revisions can be made to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the broader implications of the findings in the context of global agriculture and potential applications in other legume crops. Mention any limitations of the study, such as environmental factors that could influence the results or the need for further trials in different climatic conditions. Strengthen the conclusion by summarizing the key takeaways and suggesting future research directions. 	

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:	Sunyapat Akkarajeerawat
Department, University & Country	Bangkok Christian College, Thailand