

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_104793</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effects of Biofertilizers and Phosphorus on growth and yield of Mustard</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 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The MS is poorly written and incomplete with respect to information on materials an methods as well as results and data tables. The MS didn't explain why the study had been conducted even though there are large number of studies on such treatment for P and biofertilizers.</p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need of writing the title of MS again as well as soil initial properties in abstract.</li> <li>• Objective of study, duration and year of study, location (name of place) also need to be written in abstract.</li> <li>• Provide superiority of best treatment over control/ check in statistical terms as well as write percent increase in important parameters in best treatment over control.</li> <li>• Avoid just writing the values of the parameters for best treatment.</li> </ul> <p>4. <b>No</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>6. <b>References:</b> Cross checks the reference in the list and cited in the text; some references are missing. Strictly follow the reference writing style of the journal for citing the reference in the text and adding it to reference list.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid writing general information about mustard which necessarily increase the length of Introduction;</li> <li>• Information in review of earlier work is lacking on MS;</li> <li>• Research gap is not provided in introduction and it is needed herewith (write objective of study followed by research gap);</li> <li>• Provide sufficient references for the statements made about phosphorus and crop nutrition in last paragraph of introduction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Material and methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M and M section is incomplete and need through revision.</li> <li>• Information on the climate of location and weather condition prevailing during experimentation is lacking.</li> <li>• Information on soil initial properties need to be written herewith rather than writing in MS.</li> <li>• Experimental details is not complete;</li> <li>• practices followed for cultivation of crop was not given and need to be given herewith;</li> <li>• information on procedure followed for measurement of different parameter is lacking and need to be write herewith;</li> <li>• Statistical procedure or software used for data analysis is not mentioned.</li> </ul> <p><b>Result:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Result need to be rewriting considering the significant findings alone.</li> <li>• Indicate statistical superiority and % increases OR percent difference.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The discussion written herewith is just the review of literature and completely lack is connection of other researchers finding with research findings of the present study.</li> <li>• Discuss about findings and reasons for data presented in MS rather than writing about other findings and their reasoning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion: Missing</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION comments</b></p>	<p>-</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amit A. Shahane</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Central Agricultural University, India</b>