

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_78633
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different kinds of water on growth, yield and water use efficiency of Soybean
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 1.6

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	<p>Abstract :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There aren't the time or length of research - The results and conclusions in the abstract are described briefly and there should be no explanation of the reasons. - The keywords don't need to be too many, just kind of water irrigation, water used efficiency, yield, soybean. <p>Method :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The method has not explained how to calculate LAI? What has been described is only up to leaf area measurements, not LAI. Likewise with other response variables such as water use efficiency, straw weight, and seed yield per hectare. - To achieve the research objectives, the data obtained were analyzed using what? <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was no comment or discussion regarding the results of the water quality analysis of the various types of water given to the plantations (Table 1). - In the LAI and harvest index subsections there are statements that are antagonistic to the data in the table. In the Sentences Highest LAI was recorded untreated wastewater irrigation treatment (6.42) followed by treated waste water (6.82) while lowest LAI was observed in fresh water irrigation treatment (7.88) "Is the data in question correct in accordance with Table 3. - The results of the analysis of water quality in Table 1 were never included in the discussion. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All response variables showed improvement due to untreated water treatment except LAI and test weight. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Article text should be divided into sections and subsections. As in the results and discussion section, example : 3. Results and Discussion; 3.1 Plant Height ; 3.2 Leave Area Index etc - English grammar should be improved to make it better. - Consistency in the use of words: "different kinds of water" or "different irrigation water treatments" or "different quality of water" ? 	

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:	Noertjahyani
Department, University & Country	Universitas Winaya Mukti, Indonesia