

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102627
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Nitrogen levels and Microbial inoculants on Yield and Economics of French bean (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> 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> <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>The manuscript provides an interesting insight to the scientific community since it tries to answer pertinent issue of sustainable food production through novel methods.</p> <p>The current title is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract is well written however, the author should Include information on application/Significance of the study and way forward.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct i.e., it is well written, the experimental design is properly indicated, data analysis tools are in order, and it explains well the activities undertaken,</p> <p>Most references are recent, but a few are too old. Example 1976, 2000 etc hence the author should consider updating references older than 2005 unless such reference is explaining a method that has never been reviewed then in that case it should be included</p> <p>The author should enhance the conclusion. More details are included in the attached document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language is okay for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>For manuscript clarity and understanding, minor corrections are needed and are included in the MS attached separately.</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:	Eliud Wafula
Department, University & Country	Bomet University College, Moi University, Kenya