Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_89627**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BIOFFERTILIZER AND PLANT EXTRACTS ON GROWTH, YIELD AND YIELD ATTRIBUTING TRAITS OF FIELD PEA (Pisum sativum).**
Type of the 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 1.6

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	**Title** Please correct "Bioffertilizer" **Abstract** There is no need to mention the manuscript title in the abstract What is the meaning of @????? Replace with at the rate of **Introduction** Introduction needs enhancement, in most sections the given information is randomly strung together without a clear structure, and transition between sentences in the introduction is unclear There is not a clear hypothesis. They need to explain clearly why this research is different from the others or in which specific aspect they are focusing on. **Materials and Methods** There is no need to mention the manuscript title in materials and methods Divide materials and methods into several sections (Experimental design, Morphological traits, Yield Traits …..etc) Support your materials and methods with references. **Results and discussion** The results section lacks state of art and need one sentence at the end of each paragraph to show to readers what happen in the whole paragraph. The contents of discussion are weak. The discussion need to be enhanced with real explanations. You should also expand links to previous publications in the area, but try to be careful to not over-reach. For the latter, you should highlight potential areas of future study. **Conclusion** A detailed "Conclusion" should be provided to state the final result that the authors have reached.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	• It is necessary to improve the language. The paper is understandable for me, but it might be a problem for other people, or it does not look too well. In addition to many spelling mistakes, the document also contains too many incorrectly formulated sentences and phrases with no discernible logic. Therefore, a revision of the English language is inevitable. • The authors should make an effort to improve the quality of the Tables. • There are some errors in the format of references, please check and improve	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ahmed M. El-Sawah**
Department, University & Country	**Mansoura University, Egypt**