

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_93046</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Different Nano-NPK fertilizers on Vegetative Growth Parameter and Soil Microbial Activity of Fig Crop Under Different Irrigation Regims</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Not necessary</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract: Please mention the name of the country where the NDC is located.</li> <li>2. Result and Discussion (RnD):               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Leaf Dry Weight (LDW)  Second paragraph of RnD stated that highest LDW was achieved at 500 ppm(NPK), meant 6.80. This is not in line with Table 2 that showed the highest LDW was achieved at 400 ppm (nanofertilizer), viz. 6.84.</li> <li>b. Leaf Water Content (LWC)  Third paragraph of rnD stated that LWC increased with increasing both of irrigation rate and fertilizer levels. This is not valid for T2. Increasing irrigation rate form once to twice a week, caused decreasing LWC from 58.51 to 57.73. It should be checked.</li> <li>c. Content of Mg.  Table 3 : Highest content of Mg according to Table 3 is 0.26%, but in paper just 0.25%. Just check the consistency all values (parameters content) in tables and paper.</li> <li>d. Be consistent with 2 digits after commas in tables.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Conclusion is too general and not directly related to result of the study. Related to the title, some quantitative results should be mentioned or concisely explained in the conclusion.</li> <li>4. The term used in conclusion "low input but maximum output" may needs explanation first in terms of price, time in Result and Discussion.</li> <li>5. Conclude or mention the role of microbial activity in Conclusion.</li> <li>6. References: The author 'Stagemann <i>et al.</i>, 1985' is in the paper but not written in the list of references. Please check and recheck.</li> <li>7. English writing: belongs to, based on. etc. Please check and recheck.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	After some corrections, the paper is academically good enough to be published.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Iman Santosa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indonesian Environmental Scientists Association, Indonesia</b>