

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of a medium importance since the authors cited many times "the results were in accordance with". So, other researchers got similar results before the authors.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes. However, if it is an International Journal, the word 'zaid' is not enough. The authors need to explain what it means (see the text)</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes. However, the author did not cite the tables in the proper place along the text which diffculted the comprehension about what result they were dealing with.</p> <p>6. The authors need to pay more attention to the references they cited along the text and include then in "References"</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, no. The English language is not suitable for scholarly communications. The authors need to use the serviced of a English language native. They forgot to add determiners, for instance.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Neiva Izabel Pierozzi
Department, University & Country	Instituto Agronômico de Campinas, Brazil