

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96631
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of copper fungicide on earthworm, <i>Lampito mauritii</i>
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>It is well done and describes the current state of the research. Some recommendations are only about improving the definition of the research scope.</p> <p>Expand more the introduction section. At the end of the introduction also indicate the originality of this paper and summarize your results to help the readership anticipate and better grasp the paper.</p> <p>What is the practical utility of the results obtained</p> <p>Conclusions should include recommendations for future research.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The paper is well documented, but needs minor 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oroian Firuța Camelia
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania