

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104351
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Nano- DAP under rice-wheat cropping system in Vertisol of Chhattisgarh
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. In my opinion, the article is important for the scientific community because studies occupying plant nutrition contribute to the advance of agriculture science.</p> <p>2. It would be better to rephrase the title explaining what is Nano-Dap. Furthermore, in my opinion, the word 'vertisol' is not used appropriately.</p> <p>3. The abstract is too complicated. It would be better if you describe the overall study with simple sentences and not analyze all the treatments which place is in the 'Materials and Methods' section.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-structured with the appropriate subsections.</p> <p>5. In my view, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient. I recommend adding a few more recent citations (if it's possible).</p> <p>-In the 'Introduction' section the first and the second paragraphs are the same.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written using the English language appropriately. I recommend revising the text and correcting a few grammatical and syntax errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is well-written and I think it's very promising and inspiring for other researchers. I liked a lot the diagrams which helped me to understand easier the results of your research.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthoula Gleridou
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece