

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96053
Title of the Manuscript:	Different organic manures and their levels affected nutrient status and soil microbial activity under Rose (Rosa bourboniana Desportes) cultivation
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>)

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>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 important for scientific community as the goal of this study is to determine Effect of Different Organic Manures and their levels on nutrient status and soil microbial activity in Rose (<i>Rosa bourboniana</i> Desportes). The title of the article is suitable. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are fine, but should be formatted with same style. There are several minor comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why the font size of the abstract is different than the manuscript text? In the abstract, "The experiment was conducted by using different types of organic manures viz., farm yard manures, vermicompost and poultry manure @ control, 4 kg/m², 5 kg/m² and 6 kg/m² were applied". Please break this sentence into two sentences. The first sentence should be "The experiment was conducted by using different types of organic manures viz., farm yard manures, vermicompost and poultry manure". The second sentence should be "There were 4 treatment groups, namely, control, and 3 different concentrations (i.e., 4 kg/m², 5 kg/m² and 6 kg/m²) of these organic manures. Please fix this sentence, "For soil analysis, soil samples were taken from were taken from experimental plots after flower harvesting and dried at room temperature for 3 days and ground to pass a 30 mesh screen" to remove repetitive words. Physico chemical is a single word. Please fix this. The references should be formatted with same style. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English language is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravi P. Sahu
Department, University & Country	Wright State University, USA