

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100534
Title of the Manuscript:	Interactive effect of conservation tillage, potassium and magnesium sulphate fertilization on dry matter production, physiological and yield parameters, and yield of grain cowpea
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)
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. This work is important to the scientific community. it will contribute more to science. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is written according to the journal format. 4. The literature findings on the subject of the study have been adequately discussed. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the article should be checked again and some sentences should be corrected. 6. The literature on the subject of the study is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication. but the sentences should be checked again.	
Optional/General comments	The subject of the article is original. It will contribute to scientific studies.	

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:	Celal Cevher
Department, University & Country	Field Crops Central Researcher Institute, Turkey