

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98354
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different natural farming treatments on growth, yield and quality of pigeon pea in pigeon pea+black gram inter-cropping system in western U.P.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1.The manuscript is important for scientific community, in particular in soil and horticulture scientist communities. Unfortunately, the economics aspect as stated in Introduction is not there. It would be better if the economics aspect is discussed. 2. The title of the article would be better if changed to "Effect of different natural farming treatments on growth, yield and quality of pigeon pea in inter-cropping system in western U.P". 3. The abstract of the article is too short. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. References are sufficient and recent enough. There are 8 out of 17 are recent publications (published for the last five years). Additional comments 1. Introduction is too long. Make it concise and focused to to the topic. 2. If the economics aspect is not discussed, omit it from the Introduction part. 3. Conclusion should be more specific in clear grammar..	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article needs improvement for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iman Santosa
Department, University & Country	Indonesia