

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100942</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Integrated Nutrients Management Practices on Growth Parameters of Pointed Gourd (<i>Tricosanthes dioica</i>)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>The article is beneficial for community with a lot of effects.</b>                  2. <b>The title is well defined and suitable</b>                  3. <b>The abstract needs to be modified and more comprehensive</b>                  4. <b>The subsections are competing and well organised</b>                  5. <b>It is scientifically correct</b>                  6. <b>References are enough</b>                  7. <b>I add some comments down with full details;-</b></p> <p>- This is an interesting study and the authors have collected a unique dataset using cutting edge methodology, literature reviews.                  - The paper is generally well written and structured.</p> <p>- However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings in regards to some data analyses and text, and I feel this unique dataset has not been utilized to its full extent</p> <p>-it needs alphabetical review, adjust fonts, spaces, paragraphs, do all same font with same design                  -adjust abstract as in form of introduction, methods, result, and conclusion.</p> <p>-remove all graphs, tables, legends or figures from inside article and put all after references at end of article</p> <p>-review all references and adjust font, design for all references and organize in numerical order                  -review discussion paragraph as a whole</p> <p>-the research is relevant and interesting</p> <p>-the paper is well written, the text is clear and easy to read but needs some font, design and alphabetical review with corrections</p> <p>-the conclusion is consistent with the evidence and arguments presented</p> <p>- Maximum 1000 words allowed per research</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. I think English language is well adjusted and suitable for the article.</p> <p>- Where improvements are needed, a recommendation for major revision is typical.</p> <p>- I am ready to do the post-revision review too.</p> <p>-Review title as first.</p> <p>-Add qualifications abbreviations after title                  -the English is understandable but the paper has some typographical and grammatical errors                  - Keep images, graphs and data tables in clear view at end of article                  - You need to check referencing for accuracy, adequacy and balance.</p> <p>-limit research article to maximum 1000 words.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

	-add more keywords.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Good research, worthy for study</li><li>- the Abstract highlights the important findings of the review of fertilizers.</li><li>-the tables or figures, aid understanding and superfluous</li><li>- the research is relevant and interesting</li><li>- good sampling in analytical papers</li><li>-clarify the validity of questions, the use of a detailed methodology and the data analysis being done systematically (in qualitative research)</li> <li>- good reviews of all types and modalities of fertilizers used for agriculture in India</li> <li>- the paper's premise is interesting and important</li> <li>- the methods used are appropriate</li> <li>- the data support the conclusions</li></ul>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Ali Saad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mansoura University, Egypt</b>