

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87849
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of iron and bio-fertilizer on growth parameters and yield of baby corn (Zea mays L.) Prayagraj condition.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The introduction did not explicitly exhibit the research gap and convincing justification , why the study was done and the importance or potential benefits</li><li>• Introduction lacks coherence</li><li>• Lacks background on other sources of fertilizer their strengths and limitations compared to the bio fertilizer.</li><li>• Introduction lacks a clear background on the effects of iron to growth of baby corn in order to orient the audience.</li><li>• Objective are not smartly stated lacks the appropriate verb e.g. to assess or evaluate or determine but used a general verb to study of which all research studies intend to study</li><li>• Format of citation not consistent in other parts numbers were used in other instances author and year</li><li>• The study was done over one season hence results are not conclusive for publication</li><li>• The methodology lacks the experimental design, statistical model that was used to analyse the data and software that was used.</li><li>• Nutrient composition of the different bio fertilizers that were tested is unknown</li><li>• The summary table of results lack letters against the means to indicate the means that were significantly different.</li><li>• An unknown statistic named "CD" presented in the table of results</li><li>• Some results parameters that were mentioned in the results were not assessed for example mention of leaf area and leaf area index under the results on leaf number, mention of factors like soil moisture which were not assessed.</li><li>• Discussion of results too scanty in other areas totally lacking for example for cob yield with and without husks no discussion was presented</li><li>• No consistency on the treatments in some instances mentioned as bio fertilizers while in other instances referred to as inorganic fertilizer which are different</li><li>• Conclusion is on profitability which was not assessed and not on the results.</li></ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. I have done with my correction according to comment box sir</li><li>2. I have added background according to the journal</li><li>3. I have removed the names of scientists and changed it into citations</li><li>4.i have changed the conclusion according to comment box</li><li>5. I arranged the abstract according to the international journal</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Some few vague statements and omissions indicated in the reviewed manuscript	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	