

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103440
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT LEVELS OF VERICOMPOST ON GROWTH AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DIFFERERNT VARIETIES OF BUSH PEPPER (Piper nigrum L) UNDER PRAYAGRAJ AGRO-CLIMATIC ZONE
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>)

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. In my opinion, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The subject of your study is interesting and the findings give insight to other researchers.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-structured with the appropriate subsections.</p> <p>5. In my view, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. I suggest adding a few more references in addition to the existing ones.</p> <p><u>Notes</u> -In the "Materials and Methods" section, I propose to describe the procedure of the experiment in more detail. -The section "Results and Discussion" is too short. I suggest adding a few more sentences describing your findings compared with the results of other studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I suggest revising the manuscript and correcting a few grammatical and syntax errors.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The subject of the manuscript is interesting and the findings of the study give useful information to other researchers.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthoula Gleridou
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece