

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101496
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Integrated Nutrient Management on growth and yield of irrigated blackgram (Vigna mungo.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1/. Yes.  2/. It seems to be OK.  3/. Almost. There is no introductory part stating what problem the study tries to solve and what goals tries to achieve. Please, kindly fix these issues.  4/. They seem to be OK.  5/. Almost. 5.1/. There's no citation or protocol for the measured parameters. 5.2/. There's no citation or mention of the used statistical analysis. This information must be included in the " MATERIAL AND METHODS".  6/. There are 20 references, which seems to be OK. All of them are from this century. which is OK.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Some linguistic errors were observed and corrected throughout the text (All of these corrections can be automatically applied if you in MS Word click on "REVIEW" section and select from the menu "APPLY CHANGES". If you prefer to apply them manually then the corrections are in RED font, and the deleted parts are in RED-crossed font or on the right side of the page). Some errors are marked with YELLOW, you should remove it after correction.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Andrey Popatanasov
Department, University & Country	Institute of Neurobiology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria