

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106648
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of spacing and biofertilizer on growth and yield of Green gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i>)
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 <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript develops a current and important topic within the context of sustainable agriculture and climate change, however, the document is not very well written.</p> <p>The title is in accordance with the nature of the work, however, it could be more attractive and should be included in the place where the study was carried out in addition to completing the scientific name with the classifier.</p> <p>The abstract does not present general information that describes the research, as presented it is a summary of the main results</p> <p>The manuscript presents all the items, however, a lot of work must be done on each of them to make it more coherent with the research.</p> <p>The research must complement important aspects of the methodology and its statistical analyses to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>The bibliographic references cited in the document are very few and old and do not effectively support the arguments presented by the authors.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is recommended to review the English of the entire manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript develops a current theme, relevant to local agriculture and that can serve as a global reference, working with a kind of economic and social importance, a fundamental part of the food security of many peoples. However, methodological adjustments must be made to strengthen the research and draw truly valid conclusions. The title should attract readers and be more in line with the nature of the work. The abstract lacks the minimum elements such as: problem, justification, objectives, methodology, results and impact; As presented in the manuscript this only represents the results obtained. It does not have the objective of the investigation.</p> <p>The introduction is disorganized, it presents a lot of information without bibliographic references and the background studies are not enough to make the problem and the justification of the work clear. These studies must be presented in the international and local context; they may be in related species or in the same species. The data presented on yields or production must be current.</p> <p>The materials and methods section must clearly describe the procedures so that they are reproducible. Organize it by subtitles and delve into each of them. Clearly describe the treatments, variables and statistical analysis which can be complemented with other statistical tests of greater sensitivity.</p> <p>The results and discussion section is very descriptive and does not contain a true analysis of the information. The comparative studies that support the arguments presented by the authors are very few and old, which is why it is suggested that the authors complement this item with more articles,</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>which may be related species, more recent and where the international, national and regional context is taken into account. It is not only necessary to mention the comparative studies but also to show how they relate to this study. The analysis required must consider the biological, agronomic and economic aspects of the results found.</p> <p>The conclusions are presented as a summary of the main results found but do not show their real impact.</p> <p>The bibliographic references are very old, check the citation pattern. Improve the presentation and legends of the tables.</p> <p>Review the document which contains other specific suggestions.</p>	
--	--	--

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