

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103277
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Management of Phosphorus on Performance of Rice - Zero till Maize (Zea mays L.) Cropping System
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>In general, the work is original and would have an important effect on the region's rice and corn production.</p> <p>They should remove the word sustainable, because adding chemical fertilizers food production is not sustainable</p> <p>Yes, they should only include the main conclusion of the work</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, although they should abound in the soil collection technique, if they were tripled or mixed samples</p> <p>Yes, but they need to check the format, include & or and in the end of multiple references cited</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, they must submit it to an English review service</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The results should be presented as bar graphs including the results of the ANOVAs, not only in tables.</p> <p>The conclusion is extremely brief, and does not reflect the potential of the results obtained.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bernardo Sachman Ruiz
Department, University & Country	México