

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_98701</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Influence of sulphur and foliar application of molybdenum on growth and yield of summer cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L.)”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p><b>This manuscript does not discuss the results obtained, it does not explain the reasons for the results and the relationships, therefore, I suggest the authors add a couple of discussion paragraphs with other papers.</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript is interesting. However, there are some comments that should be considered before publication, in this way the scientific quality of the manuscript would be improved.</b></p> <p><b>Authors should consider the corrections suggested by the reviewers. In this way, the postulated manuscript would be presented reasonably, and fluently reading. Suggested citations are for genuine scientific reasons that emphasize the current topic of study in the context</b></p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Barlin Orlando Olivares</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad de Córdoba, España</b>