

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_86898
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Growth, Yield and of Forage Pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.) var. GAFB-4as influenced by Nitrogen and Weed management
Type of the 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	The manuscript is original and interesting. But I would like to draw attention to the conclusion. The conclusion notes: "Treatment 80 kg/ha nitrogen+ atrazine recorded Maximum plant height (200.52 cm), Highest plant dry weight (51.59gm), Weed density (6.00), Green Fodder yield (28.42 t/ha) which may be more preferable for farmers since it can be recommended to the farmers". But this is not enough. For the completeness of the study, it would be advisable in the final part of the work to pay special attention to the practical significance of the study and specific recommendations for farmers.	
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript notes: "Effective control of weeds with post-emergence application of herbicide may help in kharif pearl millet when spraying of pre-emergence herbicide or hand weeding and interculture operations are not feasible due to congenial conditions". It is known that the use of herbicides can have a significant negative impact on the environment and the health of consumers. In this regard, it would be advisable to pay special attention to the environmental aspect of the use of herbicides. Given the relevance of the study, it would also be appropriate to separately consider the use of mechanized weed control methods, which are more environmentally friendly and cost-effective, although they require investment.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript notes: "The benefit: cost ratio was worked out after price value of seed with straw and total cost included in crop cultivation". It would be useful to consider in detail the "the benefit: cost ratio " with specific numerical data. It was also advisable to consider in detail the overall economic efficiency of the technology used.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aleksandr N. Sekisov
Department, University & Country	Kuban State Agrarian University, Russia