

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98202
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Phosphorus and Molybdenum on growth and yield of cowpea ( <i>Vigna unguiculata</i> 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> )

### 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  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. It is important to pay attention to the genetic, biological and physiological issues related to this plant in order to improve production efficiency and increase performance.</b>  <b>2. The title of the article is appropriate.</b>  <b>3. The author should summarize the elements of the article in the abstract. But considering that this is a matter of taste, if the appearance of the abstract is modified, it will be more desirable.</b>  <b>4. The subsections are followed correctly, but it is better to move the tables to the end of the article and just mention the topics surrounding them and refer them in the text.</b>  <b>5. The article is scientifically correct.</b>  <b>6. Resources are in good condition in terms of quantity and quality.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for scientific communication.	
<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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Mohammad Reza Zargaran Khouzani
Department, University & Country	Khuzestan University of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Iran