

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104659
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of broccoli (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>italica</i>).
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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript represents a replication of SEVERAL research works already done on the subject matter: Effects of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth, Yield and Quality of Broccoli (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>italica</i>). The reviewer believes it does not present any new contribution to knowledge for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. No, they are not. The subsections under section 2 were neither properly presented nor numbered; there was no section for 'Conclusion'; key results were not presented in an easily readable format such as use of tables or figures.</p> <p>5. I don't think the manuscript is scientifically correct because, there were 15 sets of plants receiving treatments and being monitored for the effects of the treatment but there was no control plant (without treatment) to prove that any changes observed were as a result of the treatments applied. Besides, no reference was cited for the research method used.</p> <p>7. The references were okay but more than half were not recent (within ten years from date).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>2. If the manuscript is considered for acceptance, further discussion of the results should be done and results should be presented in tables and (probably) figures.</p> <p>2. There should be some statistical analysis on the results obtained.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Must follow author's guideline.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chinyere Ogbodo
Department, University & Country	Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria