

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87178
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Organic Manure and Bio-fertilizer on growth, yield and quality of Yellow Mustard (Sinapis alba 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:

(<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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should be improved as per the comments (N4-N12) 2. In the introduction part, Include recent data on area and production statistics 3. Rational and Objective of the study is missing. There must be a clear objective. 4. The methodology should be in detail. (No. of replications, cultural practices followed, method of application of organic manures and biofertilizers, details of microbial culture i.e. cfu/ml etc.) 5. The growth parameters are not discussed- either remove it from the materials and method or include in the result and discussion part 6. The discussion part should be improved with sufficient references 7. Conclusion is incomplete. Only the result of the best treatment is mentioned as conclusion. Draw some conclusion based on the result of the study 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The references should be of uniform style (either abbreviated or full name of journal) 2. Correct the manuscript as per the review comment. 3. Include more references 4. Check Gross return as per the comment N 64 5. There is a need to improve language and results and discussion part. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient data for any conclusion (1 table only as table no 2 is just calculation). 2. Other parameters (soli properties after harvest, germination, crop stand, growth parameters, root growth, plant height, days to 50% flowering etc.) should be studied for drawing a conclusion. 3. There is a need to improve language and results and discussion part. 	

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:	Nilim kalita
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India