

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101162
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Different genotype of Cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp.) for Growth and Pod Yield in Prayagraj Agro-Climatic Conditions.
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. YES 2. YES 3. The structures are not well developed especially in the introduction part, few bibliographical references; in the experimental part it is necessary to put an explanatory image of the protocol and also indicates the statistical sources used. in the results and interpretation part the discussions are very limited with a weak illustration in bibliographical references. 4. There are some failures at the level of experimental protocols with absence of protocols for processing the results. 5. The references are very limited and they must be enriched in the discussion part.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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) no	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kadri Karim
Department, University & Country	Regional Research Center in Oasis Agriculture, Tunisia