

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_75597
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different nutrient management practices on Productivity and Profitability of Double Zero Indian Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.)
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	Manuscript is technically sound but a lot of references should be added along with grammatical mistakes correction as suggested in manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comments given where needed in the manuscript file.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In abstract section, author should add experiment duration along with proper date and write one sentence of findings and also put one sentence recommendation at the end of abstract. In introduction section, author should include the references as mentioned in the manuscript. In materials and methods section, author should mention the year of study with proper dates. In result and discussion section, Poor write up and it should be corrected. Is this author findings? If yes then describe appropriate reasoning behind this. If no the mention the reference who find this. Discussion is also poor, no logics were given for results, also related scientists work is also not clear throughout the result and discussion section. 	
Optional/General comments	Over all manuscript is acceptable after these revisions.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Zeeshan Mansha
Department, University & Country	Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan