

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101788
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of different approaches of fertilizer recommendation using soluble and conventional fertilizers on Cabbage (<i>Brassica oleraceae</i> var. <i>capitata</i>) yield, nutrient requirement and economics
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>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, it is. This manuscript is interesting because it is important to compare fertilizer recommendation and evaluate their economic impact. 2. Yes, it is. 3. Yes, it is. 4. Yes, they are. It is necessary to highlight the objective of the research at the end of the introduction. Maybe conclusion section must be named instead summary section. In order to complete conclusion section, please attend the following questions: What should be the next design of experiments? What study should continue for follow-up research? Was the research objective met? please highlight it. Conclusion is very general, please also highlight the economic part. 5. Yes, I do. 6. Please include more references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General comments	Photos are desirable.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María Gretel Michel Barba
Department, University & Country	Mexico