

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101483
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different organic manure and inorganic fertilizer on growth, yield and quality of okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</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>)

Review Form 1.7

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 research topic is of importance for organic agriculture that seeks to reduce environmental impact and maintain crop productivity.</p> <p>It is suggested: Effect on the growth and yield of okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L.) of different organic fertilizers and inorganic fertilizers. No quality parameters were evaluated in the study.</p> <p>The abstract is not understandable, it lacks its basic elements such as the definition of the problem, the justification of the research, the objective, a good description of the methodologies and the results, nor does it present the impact of the study.</p> <p>The manuscript presents all the items of a scientific article, however, the authors must work hard on each one of them so that they are scientifically correct.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks fundamental elements of the scientific method.</p> <p>The references are insufficient and also those presented in the document are very outdated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is recommended, in addition to reviewing the English, the format of the journal.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors are suggested to review the specific recommendations made directly in the manuscript.</p> <p>The authors develop an important issue for agriculture such as the use and impact of fertilizers, comparing organic sources with inorganic ones, which directly affects productivity, the environment and the production costs of the productive system. The authors develop an important issue for agriculture such as the use and impact of fertilizers, comparing organic sources with inorganic ones, which directly affects productivity, the environment and the production costs of the productive system. However, the way in which the writing is presented is not the most appropriate. The title must be adjusted to the nature of the work in which only growth and performance variables are evaluated. The abstract lacks fundamental elements such as a good description of the problem, the justification, the methodology is very disorganized in this item, only the general results are mentioned but not their impact.</p> <p>A lot of information is presented in the introduction without bibliographical references. Give it an order starting with the generalities of the species, the economic importance at the global, national and regional level and the previous studies also considering these contexts. The introduction should end with the objective of the research and its scope at a biological and agronomic level.</p> <p>The methodology does not describe the procedures in detail, for which reason it is not reproducible, basic aspects of the experimental design, the agronomic management of the crop and which and how the variables and their analysis were measured are not mentioned. It is suggested to complement the statistical analyses otherwise they remain very simple. The results and discussion section is the poorest of the document, it is recommended to consult more articles that support the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	arguments presented. The tables must be related in the discussion; this must be done not only merely descriptive but also analysed from its practical implications. The bibliographical references are very few and outdated, the citation pattern is not homogeneous. Consult other sources that allow them to complement the different items of the manuscript.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Cruz Morillo Coronado
Department, University & Country	Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia