

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_90083
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect on organic manure and inorganic fertilizers on productivity parameters and quality traits of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) under central plain zone of Uttar Pradesh.
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>)

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	<p>General comments: The manuscript entitled "Effect on organic manure and inorganic fertilizers on productivity parameters and quality traits of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) under central plain zone of Uttar Pradesh has been evaluated for possible consideration in journal. Manuscript cannot be accepted in present form, and it needs major revisions and should be rewritten by making necessary suggestion as given below.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Abstract: Modify the abstract and mention about background, aim, method, results, and conclusion of the research study.</p> <p>Introductions: It needs some improvement with strong emphasis on research gap and hypothesis. It can be divided into three- four paragraphs, research background, existing available work on same aspect, limitation of the existing techniques, need for conducting study, hypothesis, objective and aim etc.</p> <p>Material and methods: rewrite this section and make paragraphs such as, experimental site, experimental design, Agronomic practices adopted, observation and data recorded, and statistical analysis.</p> <p>Results: This section needs major revision. Table 1 and figure 1 both are same. Likewise table 2 and figure 2 both gives same information. Overall dataset in results is very less, needs 2-3 more table for bringing it to the level of publication.</p> <p>Discussion: Discussion in manuscript is poorly written. Needs some improvement in term of supporting research data, explaining the reasons, comparison with similar studies on species, study limitations and future directions/ policy/plans/actions.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raj Kumar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Soil salinity Research Institute, India