

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_129014
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Yield Components of Maize as Influenced by Irrigation Intervals and Irrigation Levels
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Rather than saying, "Growth and Yield Components of Maize as Influenced by Irrigation Intervals and Irrigation Levels." "Grain yield, Growth and Yield Components of Maize as Influenced by Irrigation Intervals and Irrigation Levels."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Partly, Adding some background on irrigation interval and irrigation levels is better.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Partly, if an interaction effect on the result had a significant difference, there is no need to deal with the main factors in the abstract and the result section. If there is no significant interaction effect, there is no need to write the interaction result in the abstract.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It lacks recent references, especially in the introduction section, and needs more improvements.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Poor language quality needs major improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract section, add one sentence as background concerning irrigation interval and irrigation level, then the aim of the research or objective, and finally, what you will recommend for the user from the research findings. Also, avoid repetition of results for each parameter in the abstract. Select core parameters contributing more to grain yield, such as growth and yield attributing parameters. 2. Write keywords in alphabetical orders 3. The introduction is very shallow. It needs improvement and is supported by different research findings. The last two paragraphs also need a reference: "Who says this?" 4. The materials and method section is not discussed properly, and it is very shallow 5. The results and discussion sections are poorly written. Writing them as separate sections would be better to make them more readable and allow for a deep interpretation. 6. The result showed that the two main factors and interactions significantly differed. However, for scientific research, if there is an interaction effect, we are only forced to discuss the interaction effect, and there is no need to discuss the main factor. Please read something about scientific analysis to realize this issue. The discussion or interpretation of the result should include our result. What does it imply? Who did similar research, and what did they obtain? 7. The conclusion is also shallow. The conclusion should include one line of background, then the aim, then the method, lastly, some comprehensive idea about the result from the research findings, and finally, a recommendation for the user based on the result. But this paper lacks it. 8. As a general comment, this research may contribute more to the scientific community concerning irrigation intervals and levels for maize. However, it lacks more information on discussing irrigation intervals and levels as a background, and overall, the paper is not well organized. Therefore, for accepting this paper, needs major modification concerning the overall paper quality 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Selamawit Bekele Degefu</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia</p>