

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87584
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of maize hybrids under agro-climatic conditions of Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India
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	<p>The purpose of the study was to evaluate ten maize (Zea mays L.) hybrids under agro-climatic conditions. Three replications were used in the Randomized Block Design (RBD) investigation. According to the report's results, UM-12 produced higher plant height (217.05 cm), number of leaves per plant (12.80), dry weight per plant (151.25 g), cob length (16.62 cm), number of rows per cob (14.80), number of grains per row (31.73), seed yield (8.27 t/ha), and stover yield (20.50 t/ha) than other maize hybrids. As a consequence, the maize hybrid UM-12 was discovered to be the most suited, productive, and cost-effective for the agro-climatic conditions.</p> <p>The core principle of this work is sound, but the presentation is poor, and the language is a jumble of weak sentences. There are several verbs and sentences that have been repeated more than once. The writers were unable to address the research objectives issue because there are no longer any modes of action that are well-supported by graphics. The authors were unable to effectively respond to the original study's main question by covering essential subtopics. The introduction section is extremely brief and does not address all of the study's points. Material and method should be spotlighted as separate points so that all methods are thoroughly covered with references. What was the source of these maize hybrids? What statistical software was used in this study? Where are your graphs with standard deviation or standard error? Did you identify the significance of the data using LSD analysis? Please utilize statistical analysis to support anything you've said. What statistical tools were used in this work? Where are your standard deviation or standard error graphs? Did you use LSD analysis to determine the significance of the data? You should use statistical analysis to back up your points. In the results and discussion section, the author listed all of the items along with their findings, but did not go through each topic individually. To back up their notes and opinions, they used the oldest references. In this work, no photographs of the planted field without the author's photo or the treated plant with the control revealed the plant 's root and shoot systems. Because your five photographs didn't show any results, you can include them in the procedure section as a single shot that just highlights your steps. The conclusion and references sections were simply inadequate.</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable suggestions, I have made changes in manuscript according to your instructions.</p>
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	