

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87596
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Bio fertilizers and Zinc on growth and yield of Lentil (Lens culinaris 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>)

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>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The abbreviations should be clearly defined in the abstract, at first use. In the case of a single a usage like “psb” and “vam”, they should be the full word. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- According to the author's guidelines, the authors should clearly define the problem, propose a solution and include the scope as well as the justification of the work done.- The lentil (<i>Lens culinaris</i> or <i>Lens esculenta</i>)....In the blanket should be replaced with the scientific name.- The country name (India) must start with the capitalized letter.- Acronyms and abbreviations must be fully explained at the time of initial appearance. Avoid starting a sentence with an acronym or short form.- The authors should explain more detail about the PSB and VAM. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- According to the author's guidelines, the method should give adequate information to allow the experiment to be reproduced. The methods of this manuscript need more clarity in detail, such as the treating technique (times and period for treating), preparation method of biofertilizers, and the parameters of the results.- The statistical analytical technique should be clearly presented (not only in the abstract). <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The tables of statistical results should be clearly presented. The compare means and <i>P</i> values should be appeared.- Table1, are the growth parameters in the treatment 3 significantly higher than that of the treatment 2?- Table 2, are the yield parameters in the treatment 3 significantly higher than that of the treatment 6?- The author should explain the data in each table by comparing each treatment with statistical results.- The discussion section should be separated.- The discussion should provide detailed interpretation of data and interpret the significance of the result. For example, discussing about the higher data found in the treatments of <i>Rhizobium</i> when compare to the treatments of PSB and VAM and suggesting the reason(s) by giving the citations to support or argue the results. In addition, suggesting that the derived pleasant result is because of only <i>Rhizobium</i> or both <i>Rhizobium</i> and ZnSO_4 and also giving the citations.- The authors should indicate that differences in zinc concentrations may or may not have an effect on each parameter.- ZnSo4 should be replaced with ZnSO_4 <p>References</p> <p>The reference style must be followed by the author's guided. According to the author guidelines, every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- There are a lot of grammar errors and typos, please check thoroughly.- Authors should be cautious about pre- and post-period spaces.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Varaporn Veraplakorn
Department, University & Country	Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand