

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJECC_96522
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic mulches and inorganic mulches in ridge gourd var. Arka prasan
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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>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>Detailed observations and recommendations can be seen on the manuscript.</p> <p>I appreciate that the studies done by the authors are relevant for the scientifically community, as well as for farmers. It improves the knowledge regarding the different mulches effects on ridge gourd and open the perspective to use in practice the better variant, with the best obtained results.</p> <p>For the title I suggest:</p> <p>Effect of Organic and Inorganic Mulches on Ridge Gourd Variety Arka Prasan</p> <p>No. Instructions for authors have not been respected. Different sub-sections, as given below, should be used.</p> <p>Unfortunately, no.</p> <p>Abstract needs to be reviewed and prepared according to Instructions for authors.</p> <p>Materials and Methods section will include sub-sections.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>2.1. The experimental site</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.2. The biological material</p> <p>...</p> <p>2.3. The experimentally variants and the experimental design</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.4. The parameters determined</p> <p>2.4.1. Growth parameters</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.4.2. Chlorophyll estimation</p> <p>2.4.3. Flowering parameters</p> <p>.....</p> <p>2.4.4. Yield parameters</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<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>.....</p> <p>2.5. Statistical analysis</p> <p>.....</p> <p>I think so.</p> <p>Yes. But the section needs to be carefully reviewed and prepared by the authors according to Instructions for authors.</p> <p>REFERENCES</p> <p>1.the first citation from the text.....[1]. Not alphabetical order.</p> <p>Reference to a journal:</p> <p>Example:</p> <p><i>For Published paper:</i></p> <p>1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Delian Elena</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</p>