

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_96793</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Combined Effect of Nitrogen and Phosphatic fertilizer on the activity of the Nitrate reductase enzyme in different wheat cultivars</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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> This manuscript is robust and technically sound.	<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>Compulsory</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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Yes.</b>  2. <b>Yes could be suitable; however, another title is here suggested.</b> <b>Combined Effect of Nitrogen and Phosphorus on the activity of the Nitrate reductase enzyme in different wheat cultivars</b>  3. <b>Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive.</b>  4. <b>Yes.</b>  5. <b>Yes, The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b>  6. <b>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</b>  <b>Manuscript, is short and precise.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. Yes, English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communication. 2. Suggestion made within the text body of article should be evaluated and accepted or rejected by author(s).	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good work was done, though thorough corrections need to be made as authors deem fit and appropriate.	

### **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>Grace O. Tona</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria</b>