

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102984
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Bio-fertilizers and Phosphorus on Yield and Economics of Toria (Brassica campestris L.)
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. This manuscript is essential for the scientific community to share information and technologies. Yes The abstract should include gaps in the research. It also lacks information on the sort of data obtained, the method of data collection, and the conclusion. Some terms like "like" should be avoided in your study, especially in the abstract and method section. The manuscript's sub-sections and structures are poorly organized, particularly under methods and materials (Study area description, methodology, experimental design and treatments, Data type and collection methods, Data analysis) and results (Separate subtitle: separate effects of each treatment and their combination are not clearly stated). No. Because the gap in the study area has not been thoroughly investigated. Methods, results, discussion, and conclusions are not well organized. The outcome is not compared to the findings of other authors. The interpretation and discussion sections are too shallow. Reference and citation are more important in the result and discussion sections. A review of the literature is especially important for economic analysis. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	It's good. However, each subtitle requires further explanation.	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siraj Beshir Sheko
Department, University & Country	Madda Walabu University, Ethiopia