

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87437
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of plant growth regulator (TA-41) on growth and yield of wheat. (Triticum aestivum 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the map of study area. • Provide the full form of all the parameters. • Write down the proper symbols of treatment in whole document. • Better to add photos to confirm the results on different treatments on application of plant growth regulator • Kindly follow all the comments given in the manuscript. • Cross check the references in the text and write according to journal format and follow the same format throughout the manuscript. • Add more references in the discussion part • the same format through the reference section and write the references in Follow proper order • Avoid repetition of words in the whole manuscript. • Add all the comments in your manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve your language. • Check spellings. • Follow the same reference style i.e., use comma, space etc. at right place. • It is suggested that use comma's, space etc. properly in the whole document. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title is written very well, impressive and informative. • Abstract is also qualitative and directly shows the research importance. • Introduction is comprehensively written. • Whole manuscript is very knowledgeable. • Conclusion is easy to interpret and brief. 	

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:	Kartikey Sahil
Department, University & Country	India