

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_93057
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of wastes of taro leaf, sugar beet and saw dust on physiochemical parameters of produced vermicompost
Type of the Article	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript can be accepted for publication if the author(s) revise the paper again (point-by-point) and improve the manuscript accordingly.</p> <p>Highly recommended to rewrite the manuscript/ improve the text following the reviewer's comments and correct the text accordingly.</p> <p>Presentation: Good and in an acceptable form</p> <p>Abstract: Need to improve the text. Sentence structure is not so good. Single paragraph (rather than two paragraphs) is highly appreciated.</p> <p>Introduction: Okay (need improvement; check the attached review)</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Good (Few sentences need more clarification)</p> <p>Results: Quite good representation. Some changes required (check the reviewer's comments). Presentation of key findings with some tables and figures is highly appreciable.</p> <p>Discussion: Need improvement (check the review). Highly recommended to provide suitable recommendations and suggestions. It is a good idea to add a conclusion part separately.</p> <p>References: All the references must be numbered consecutively/serially in the text for better understanding and recheck according to the journal's guidelines. Some references do not cited properly. Author(s) have to check the references again.</p> <p><i>(For more details, please check the attached reviewer's comments)</i></p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence structure and representation are not well-written. Authors should check the English language, typographical, grammatical errors, scientific name, etc. very carefully • Research idea: good • In some cases, need justification. • Citation should be used properly. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several grammatical mistakes • Revise and improve the manuscript following reviewer's comments before final submission • Major revisions required • Need clarification in some points. • Reviewer encourages the author(s) to check each reference precisely, and arrange it perfectly according to the Journal's format for better representation. • Statistical values should mention perfectly. 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shourav Dutta
Department, University & Country	Rangamati Science and Technology University, Bangladesh