

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)
<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>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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, I believe that this manuscript has important information regarding crucial factors on soil physics, chemics and biology. Its importance is difficult to measure, because it is hard to visualize the gains farmers will be having on knowing it.</p> <p>2. The title is clear, straight forward, and direct to the point. Yes, good title.</p> <p>3. I believe it is well written, describing enough to be understood. Just think that if there is the lethal dose being used, it cannot be said that "subtoxic" level of copper will be used.</p> <p>4. I believe that it is well structured, but there is information that should not be in some parts, e.g., description of the <i>Lampito mauritii</i> in material and methods. A big part of this section would be better in introduction. And I would prefer looking a statistics subsection, not only a phrase.</p> <p>5. Yes, however, I would recommend using a specific length of worm so the comparison would be better to understand.</p> <p>6. I found the references sufficient, but not recent. 9/56 references are from the last 10 years, so less than 20% of the references are recent. I would suggest changing this for at least 50% recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is sufficiently suitable for scholarly communications, but I recommend passing through an English speaker revision before being released.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	some English terminology that should be written correctly, adding the statistics on a section or in all material and methods sections, and adding more recent references.	

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:	Ricardo Rubin Balardin
Department, University & Country	University of Puerto Rico, Brazil