

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_102378</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A comprehensive review on the effect of sugarcane trash ash on the sorption, degradation and leaching of atrazine and fipronil in agricultural soils</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review 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> )

-

## 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)
<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>The manuscript written is research in mineral nutrients in the soil</b>  2. <b>The title of the article is in accordance with the contents</b>  3. <b>The abstract article need peer-reviewed journal template</b>  4. <b>The structure of the manuscript still needs fix adjust journal template</b>  5. <b>The script needs to be in need setting and spacing to an explanation</b>  6. <b>References are sufficient</b>  .	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  1. The quality of the writing is quite good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This article still needs improvement if it is published in a journal and need to check again the similarity	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anang Susanto
Department, University & Country	Merdeka University, Indonesia