

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_102041</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of Cow Based Liquid Manures and Spacing on Growth and Yield of Cowpea (Vigna Unguiculata L.) under Natural Farming</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1.The manuscript is important for the community. The information from this study can be shared to farmers/the users that the liquid manure as foliar can be make by-product.</p> <p>2.The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract does not completely describe the main points of this study. The aim of the study and the treatments are not shown.</p> <p>4. The subsections are not inline with the journal guidelines.</p> <p>5. Although it is scientifically correct, the factorial design or split plot is more applicable to compare the mean differences among the treatments. Methodology is not detail expressed such as time of application(foliar or soil) and it is needed to make some changes. The current results are not definitely known which liquid manures and which spacing are better. The experiment is done only one season. It is better to carry out at least 2 season/years. In the conclusion, there is needed to explain how the research is important and the recommendation is given to user clearly and effectively.</p> <p>6. The references are not synchronized in para and reference part. Some are missing in paragraph, and some are not in reference.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The paragraph is too long. The sentences have not linked each other. The writing styles and spelling should be improved.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Daisy Myint</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Myanmar</b>