

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_104450</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficient Use of Nano-Fertilizer for Increasing Productivity and Profitability along with Maintain Sustainability in Rice Crop; A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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**

	<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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	I consider that it is convenient to point out the intention and the effort that the authors make in wanting to make the manuscript and bring an experience to a research product, that is certainly valuable and recognized. I think it would be an interesting model to improve and clearly establish originality. Your work is interested, written well, and organized. However, there are some comments should be considered before publishing, in this way, the scientific quality of the manuscript would be improved. I suggest the authors update the bibliography, many of the citations are more than 15 years old, therefore I suggest adding recent references which address the issue in question. Suggested citations are for genuine scientific reasons that emphasize the current topic of study in context. Authors should consider the corrections suggested by the reviewers. In this way the postulated manuscript would be reasonably presented, fluent reading.	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Barlin Orlando Olivares</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Cordoba, Spain</b>