

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102180
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of organic manures and rice residues on Yield attributes of Taramira (Eruca sativa Mill.)
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The paper entitled "Response of organic manures and rice residues on Yield attributes of Taramira (Eruca sativa Mill.)" talks about a very important topic and is in line with the focus of the journal.</p> <p>The paper describes a two-year trial conducted at the research farm of the Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry at [NAI], SHUATS, Prayagraj. The experiment started during the rabi seasons of 2021-22. The initial assessment of the soil sample taken from the experimental site indicated that the land had a nearly leveled topography with a slope ranging from 1-3%.</p> <p>During the field experimentation, nine different treatments were applied, which involved the combined use of NPK (nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium) fertilizers and various organic manures such as farmyard manure (FYM), vermicompost, and jeevamrutha. The results showed that the treatment labeled as T6, which consisted of 100% NPK, 100% vermicompost (VC), 100% recommended dose of fertilizer (R), and 100% zinc (Zn), produced the most significant outcomes in terms of growth factors.</p> <p>Treatment T6 resulted in the highest plant height (122.2 cm) and the highest number of siliquae per plant (78.5), which in turn influenced the number of seed siliquae per plant (5.61), oil content (36.96%), and the weight of 100 grains (3.5 g). Consequently, this treatment yielded the highest mean grain yield (1.65 t ha⁻¹), straw yield (3.18 t ha⁻¹), biological yield (4.83 t ha⁻¹), harvest index (34.18%), net returns (88,133.00 and 88,638.00.50 Rs ha⁻¹), and wider cost-benefit (C:B) ratios (1:1.46 and 1:1.47) compared to the other treatments.</p> <p>Overall, the results suggest that the conjunctive use of NPK fertilizers and specific organic manures, as demonstrated in treatment T6, resulted in the most favorable outcomes in terms of crop growth, yield, and economic returns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is suitable and clear 2. The abstract is comprehensive, well structured, and well written. 3. The paper is structured according to the IMRAD method. 4. References are sufficient and recent 5. The introduction is too poor and don't reflect the interest of the paper, because the introduction of a scientific paper serves to provide background information, highlight the research gap, state research objectives or questions, and emphasize the significance of the study. It sets the stage for the reader by introducing the topic and explaining why the research is important. It should be concise and engaging. Start with a broad statement, provide brief background information, identify the research gap, state the research objectives or questions, and explain the significance of the study. Avoid jargon and maintain clarity. 6. The methodology is too poor and don't reflect the interest of the paper, because the 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>methodology section of a scientific paper must describe the study design, participants, data collection methods, data analysis techniques, ethical considerations, and limitations. It should be concise and clear. Explain the study design, participant characteristics, and data collection methods. Briefly mention the data analysis techniques and ethical considerations. Acknowledge any limitations or potential sources of bias. Provide enough information for replication while maintaining brevity.</p> <p>7. The conclusion is too poor regarding the interest of the work; the conclusion must be rewritten. Because the conclusion is intended to help the reader to understand why your research should matter to them after they have finished reading the paper. A conclusion is not merely a summary of your points or a re-statement of your research problem, but a synthesis of key points.</p> <p>8. Scientifically the manuscript talks about an important topic but it must be reworked before publication.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable	
Optional/General comments	///	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Atef Ahriz
Department, University & Country	Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University, Algeria