

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC_104915
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT INORGANIC FERTLIZERS AND BIO FERTILIZERS ON GROWTH, YIELD AND QUALITY OF OKRA (Abelmoschus esculentus 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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Question 1: yes, "Biofertilizers versus inorganic fertilizers: Their effects on Okra (Abelmoschus esculentus L. Moench)"</p> <p>Question 3: no, too much information,</p> <p>Question 4: no, write.</p> <p>Question 5: methodologically yes but it is incomplete. Question 6 yes.</p> <p>According to the Vancouver convention the paper must be structured as</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction 2. Material and Methodology 3. Results 4. Discussion 5. Conclusion <p>The section "conclusion" is missing therefore the paper is incomplete. I have re-arranged the paper because the tables should be placed under the section "results" as they are the results. All abbreviations should be explained and defined. For mass, volume, weight the SI-units should be used. If there are too long tables, give a graphical representation to support the tables</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	See my corrections in the reviewed text	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	The paper needs a complete redress and review, as the logical treat is sometimes obscure. The conclusion is missing. Was the research question responded to or not? (see my corrections in the paper)	

Review Form 1.7

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uwe C. Plachetka
Department, University & Country	University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Austria