

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_103808</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Performance of Cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L.) Genotypes for Growth, Yield &amp; Quality Under Prayagraj Agro-climatic Condition</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

	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The study of the processes of growth and development of plants is one of the main tasks of agricultural science. In modern society, legumes are of particular importance, which provide people with protein, and the soil with biological nitrogen.</p> <p>The title of the article is fully consistent with the content, but the authors need to add more than just the region, as well as the name of the country.</p> <p>The abstract corresponds to the obtained results.</p> <p>In the Introduction, the authors made a reference to only one author (Vavilov, 1951), who is not on the REFERENCES list. The article completely lacks references to studies by other scientists, but 14 authors are written in the REFERENCES list. It is unacceptable.</p> <p>The REFERENCES list is very poorly designed. They are not designed in accordance with the requirements.</p> <p>The names of the drawings are written without No.</p> <p>The descriptions of the tables and the figure are very short and do not fit the discussion.</p> <p>When describing the research results and indicating the best genotype, the authors did not pay any attention to the results of the analysis of variance. If this was done, the authors saw that their conclusions do not advise realities (the difference between the options is within the error of experience). It is present in all tables.</p> <p>The authors need to revise the English language, there are a lot of errors.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sergiy Lavrenko</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kherson State Agrarian and Economic University, Ukraine</b>