

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95744
Title of the Manuscript:	Production potential of fodder crops in sapota based hortipasture system under shallow degraded soils in transitional tract of peninsular India
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>)

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>1. Yes, I can confirm that the manuscript is essential, since the subject is related to very important agricultural practices, with economic impact.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable; I have no remark.</p> <p>3. Being a research paper, the Abstract needs some original data or percentage between the different tested treatments.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure is all right.</p> <p>5. Yes, it seems to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. There are enough references and quite recent ones. Unfortunately, they are not correctly cited in the text, so the entire section needs to be revised. For example, some papers are not cited at all, like Anonymous (2021), Macharia et al. (2011) etc. Others are wrong names – „Gomez and Gomez” or „Gomez and Gomes”, Iqbal et al. (2018 or 2019)... etc.? Please check and correct the entire paper, especially since there are a lot of additional spaces between words.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English is acceptable, suitable for a scientific paper.	
<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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Berca Mihai
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania