

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_109235
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TILLAGE, CROP RESIDUE MANAGEMENT AND NUTRIENT LEVELS ON ENERGETICS, MICROBIAL GROWTH, DEHYDROGENASE ACTIVITY, WEED PARAMETERS, QUALITY PARAMETERS AND SOIL PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF MAIZE (Zea mays L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <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>The manuscript is very important as it seeks to expound further unique ways in ensuring productivity and sustainability altogether</p> <p>The title is a little more robust, too much wording for a manuscript title "Effect of different tillage practices on nutrients energetics, microbial, soil physico – chemical properties and quality of maize</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but could be summarized further</p> <p>The subsections and structures are appropriate however, tables discussed in the results section should follow suite the results and not after the conclusion section</p> <p>Manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The conclusion part looks too short. A good conclusion part should lead to research perspectives for future work. More elaboration on the uniqueness of the current work should be emphasized along with the future research orientations which can be pursued based on the present results</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:	Angela Lartey-Young
Department, University & Country	University of Cape Coast, Ghana