

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99123
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Evaluation of Site Specific Drip Fertigation in Tomato
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community, because a field study was conducted on the benefit of fertilization. Thus increasing the vegetable yield. So that the composting process is based on a scientific study.</p> <p>1. Yes, the title of the article suitable.</p> <p>2. The summary lacks mention of the values or percentage of improvement in the results obtained after the fertilization process that was mentioned in the article.</p> <p>3. Yes, suitable.</p> <p>4. Yes, correct.</p> <p>5. References are sufficient, but references No. 1 and references No. 12 are old References.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. There are some acronyms. The detailed name of the acronym was not mentioned when it was mentioned for the first time. Rather, the detail of the acronym was mentioned after mentioning it several times.</p> <p>2. In the introduction section, an additional paragraph should be added before the last two paragraphs, a study of a previous manuscript and then a comparison with the manuscript proposed by you.</p> <p>3. There are Figures that contain unclear words, signs, and numbers that are difficult to read, such as Figure 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.</p> <p>4. There are some figures that do not come after the explanation that referred to the figure, for example Figure 12 is very far from the explanation for it that was referred to, as well as Figure 13. Usually, any figure placed in research papers must be placed after the paragraph in which the figure is referred to.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amera Istiqlal Badran
Department, University & Country	Mosul University, Iraq