Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_95762**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB on growth, yield attributes, yield and economics of Mungbean (Vigna radiata (L.) Wilczek).**
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://www.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)*
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)**	1. Please define the meaning of the acronym used during the first time it is used. 2. In the abstract, please use the appropriate word. Do not short cut. Like "Mung" for "Mungbean". 3. Additional data on the physical properties of the experimental area is needed, such as bulk density, porosity, hydraulic conductivity, etc. 4. Do the authors employ irrigation when there is no rain? How much do you apply? Please include this information. 5. The statistical analysis of this study is not clear. You should do analysis of variance (ANOVA). If significant difference is observed in treatment means, then post hoc test or comparison of means should follow. I suggest that the authors will use the Tukey's test. 6. Chemical analysis of the FYM should be clearly presented in tabular form for easier view and reference. 7. I suggest that authors will do regression analysis to check at which level of FYM and phosphorus the mungbean parameters achieves its maximum value. 8. Better to present some data in bar graph for easy view and reference. 9. Kindly consider the heavy metal contamination of the FYM in the case of long-term fertilization. 10. If possible, consider also the nutrient uptake of the mungbean and do a correlative analysis with the fertilizer applied and nutrient taken in. 11. Nutrient use efficiency could also be analyzed and be included in the manuscript. This will add value to the message of the current paper.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments	The study is interesting and bears good results. However, the author needs to highlight the motivation of the study or the background of the study. Many studies pertaining FYM are already available. The authors are suggested to improve the clarity and present their results in a more systematic way.	

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ronley C. Canatoy**
Department, University & Country	**Central Mindanao University, Philippines**