

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104527
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Sulphur and Molybdenum on growth and yield attributes of Field Pea (<i>Pisum Sativum</i> L.)
Type of the 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <u>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</u></p> <p>2. <u>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</u></p> <p>3. <u>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</u></p> <p>4. <u>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</u></p> <p>5. <u>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</u></p> <p>6. <u>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</u></p> <p><i>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</i></p>	<p><u>The manuscript is very important for the scientific community and offers interesting ideas for research.</u></p> <p><u>The title of the article is apt and very effective</u></p> <p><u>The abstract of the article is exhaustive and ensures that the reader immediately understands the investigation.</u></p> <p><u>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and complete at all points.</u></p> <p><u>The manuscript is scientifically correct</u></p> <p><u>The references are sufficient and recent but I would still improve them to ensure that scholars can better study the paper examined.</u></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <u>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</u></p>	<p><u>The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for academic communication, it is fluent and correct</u></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><u>The work is clear, very interesting. The reading is very smooth and this guarantees a good understanding.</u></p>	

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carmine Boniello
Department, University & Country	University of Salerno, Italy