

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103325
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Integrated nutrient management on yield, uptake and soil properties of pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.) in alluvial soil of Gird region of Madhya Pradesh.
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The findings of the study are quite interesting but not well-documented and explained. 2. The title is too general whereas the study conducted only representing small portion of the stated title. The author is advised to make the title more specific to the objectives of the study. 3. The abstract is not comprehensive and not representing the outcome of the study. 4. Structure is ok but subsection is needed in results and discussions. 5. Some research methodology is quite ambiguous. 6. References are ok. <p>Additional comments/suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In abstract, author may add in the sample analysis and statistical analysis use in the study. 2. In introduction, some facts have no references and general statement is often made without being specific on the scope of the study. The aims of the study is not being highlighted. 3. In materials and methods, the authors emphasizing on the treatments only without mention on the sampling technique, sampling period and factors being blocked by using RCBD experimental design. Apart from that, the partitioning of parameters is ambiguous (example: available N?P K is it for soil or plant?. The method use for samples analysis is absence in the text. 4. In Results and Discussion, the author needs to highlight the treatment as a footnote under the Table. Also, the comparison made in the text stating the significant difference, but the comparison is nowhere to be found in the Table. The shortform used is confusing, eg FYM is stand for what? Before using the abbreviation, the full name needs to be mentioned first. The discussion is not well-written and need to be revised. 5. The conclusion need to highlighted the achievement based on the objectives stated. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The English is poor, and some is not well written resulting in misleading of facts and information.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Please revise the language, terms used	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nur Qursyna Boll Kassim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia