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	1. **Under the abstract, the authors should remove the title of the manuscript. Also, small letters should be used for all the mentioned variables e.g plant height and not Plant height. The symbol @ in the abstract section should be replaced with appropriate text. The first letter of the abstract should be replaced - with and should read " A field experiment was conducted ....."** 2. **Introduction section: This section lacks a lot of citation and the information given on the field pea is not appropriate for the write-up. A lot of comments have been highlighted on the manuscript for possible amelioration of the manuscript. Finally, the last part of the introduction does not present the specific objectives of the work.** 3. **Remove the title from - the materials and methods section. The first part of this section should be a brief description of the study site; location, soil, climate, vegetation.** 4. **The manuscript is poorly arranged and cumbersome to understand. Authors should rearrange the manuscript according to the scientific standard way.** 5. **The methodology is clearly written. See other validly published articles for arrangement of methodology.** 6. **The results are not well presented for a field experiment. Please include the standard errors of means with small case letters showing the statistical differences in the various treatments.** 7. **Write out in details the results of the various variables and if possible use subheadings**	
Minor REVISION comments	The use of capital letters is abused. Most of them have been marked yellow for possible correction.	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Asafor Henry Chotangui**
Department, University & Country	**University of Dschang, Cameroon**