

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104201
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Weed Management Practices on Growth, Yield and Quality of Okra [<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L.) Moench].
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>The concept of the research was good. The experimental design was also appropriate towards obtaining relevant information.</p> <p>The title is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but the language can be improved upon to strengthen the quality of the work. The conclusion should be included.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. The authors only need to strengthen the language.</p> <p>The references are sufficient but majority of them are out- dated. Writing authors in capital letters is not allowed.</p> <p>The tables with lines in-between There is inconsistency in the style used in referencing, Authors should reconcile and use a single format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. The language is fair but it can be improved upon check the results and write properly. After from this,</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors may wish to look at the results and write them out properly. This should be followed by justifying the result and taking next trip ton</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kayode Ogunjobi
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria