

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100157
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic manures and biofertilizers on soil properties, productivity and nutrient uptake of Indian mustard
Type of the 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Effect of organic manures and biofertilizers on soil properties, productivity and nutrient uptake of Indian mustard</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community in the sense that it tackles a topic which is science in nature. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article was comprehensive but it can be improved by adding one or two sentences which will serve as its introduction. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, it is scientifically correct. 6. The references are not sufficient enough <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction is comprehensive. However, it is recommended to add more ideas/literature about the said topic especially about the overall effect of organic manures and biofertilizers 2. For the materials and methods, it is recommended to state the different stages/process. In short, just arrange it in an organize and systematic way. 3. For the result, it is well-presented and organized. Also, necessary explanations/discussions were provided. The only thing lack for this part is the number of supporting statements for the result. As much as possible, add literatures/references that was conducted in recent years and/or those paper with numerous citations. Last, it is highly suggested to add or incorporate inferential; statistics to make the result more meaningful and relevant. The result alone can show the effects of manures and bio-fertilizer, however, it can be best presented/showed/stated if there is a direct comparisons to each group/formula tested. 4. The conclusion was comprehensive and appropriate. 5. For the reference, add more 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</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:	Jomell M. Santiago
Department, University & Country	Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines