

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110922
Title of the Manuscript:	“Effect of irrigation scheduling and different sowing dates on growth and yield of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)”
Type of the Article	

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. (Yes, this manuscript is relevant for scientific community as well as end user; because irrigation practice depends on agro-climatic condition, soil, crop and other management like irrigation interval etc.) 2. (The title is Appropriate) 3. Good, but minor tense rearrangement required 4. Minor correction is required on (section or subsection. I suggested basic commented on manuscript body. It is good if the authors. Scientific writing procedure especially on result section; this means that starting ANOVA (statistical test) following mean comparison, then finding justification (reasoning /finding explanation). 5. Good, but some correction is required on grammar cosmetics or sentence structure and word flow modification is necessary. 6. Reference scarcity under (Introduction and Result part). The author use many paragraph of other finding or report but they were not acknowledged/ cited introduction part. Under result only you (author) put only the result, similar work/others findings were important for scientific reasoning (compare and contrasting your finding) ❖ ADDITIONAL COMMENT Conclusion part is not well written rewrite please	Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor Language quality improvement required in some part especially, wording and sentence coherence	
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)	