

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC_104915
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT INORGANIC FERTILIZERS AND BIO FERTILIZERS 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://journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The title, objective, result and Discussion and final conclusion didn't show coherence to my evaluation. They are not well correlated.</p> <p>Why this study was required? Not well written.</p> <p>No conclusion remarks/at least one sentence in abstract,</p> <p>Is the research activity conducted in 2022? Or 2023? (look comment).</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> not well written,</p> <p>Reference: citation in the body of the draft and in the final bibliography not written standard (check comment) ,</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b> Not well described/lacks major stepwise application of treatments</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check comments (same to above)</li> <li>• Rewrite it appropriate</li> <li>• Try to use recent references for your review ex. DAR. 2004</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion part and recommendation if possible:</b>is lacking</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>	I strongly recommend this material need very major revision	

### 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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Girma Hailemichael
Department, University & Country	Jimma Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia