

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_89113
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Nitrogen and Zinc levels on growth and yield of Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-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	This article is not scientifically sound. Seems to be more like a preliminary test. Not a full length research article Seems like a rushed article, no attention given to punctuation, grammar, citation and referencing. No of words around 1500 minus references-shows no serious effort from the author to discuss the current work In terms of method-experiment conducted only once, results not scientifically valid For food crop-when testing plant nutrients, having 9 trt is not easy to get true positive results. This current study might have given false positive What is the method used for statistical analysis? LSD, Tukey etc The current table is not self explanatory Every para, there is one citation at the end, is that enough? This is wrong, need to learn the art of writing a scientific article A mere 16 references for original article, that says a lot on the poor quality of this manuscript Overall this manuscript is very poorly structured with no proper discussion, Material methods not clear	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deivaseeno Dorairaj
Department, University & Country	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia