

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100353
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of vermicompost and inorganic fertilizer on productivity of late sown wheat
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Importance: They measured the influence of a balanced mix of organic and inorganic fertilizers (vermicompost and RDF at different concentrations) to maintain a sustainable yield that helps to feed the ever-increasing population.</p> <p>2. Title: Clear to a greater extent but preferred to be modified into “Ameriolation of Vermicompost and Inorganic Fertilizer on late-sown wheat Productivity”.</p> <p>3. Abstract: The opening statement is too long and has to be more concise. Display the full names of the used abbreviations at their first appearance. Many modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>4. Structure of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords: Rearrange in alphabetical order for more understanding. Introduction: Improperly displayed in six large paragraphs. Re-arrange into three paragraphs only i.e., 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Many modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. The aim: Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding. Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No institutional ethical approval number was provided. Why the authors provided results on the treatments in the materials and methods section? The authors did not provide the statistical analysis section with a reference and the statistical model used. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Results: Novel and clear to a certain extent. Add the P-value for the significant results in the text. The authors have to avoid the over illustrations of the numerical values in the text and the repetition of the treatment details. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Discussion: Clear and informative with moderate comparison and speculation. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. Conclusion: Not listed Tables: Well-presented and organized. Figures: Well-presented and organized. <p>5. Scientific Soundness: The manuscript discussed a good idea with poor English and grammar that requires quite professional proofreading and copyediting.</p> <p>6. References: MUST BE UPDATED as 25.7% (9 out of 35) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to 30-40%. The old reference indicates less interest in the study field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>General view: The manuscript was written in poor English and grammar. Professional copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value and enhance the importance of the study.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt