

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100089</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Enhance of Soil Health Parameters by using Integrated Nutrient Management in Green gram (Vigna radiata L.) var. Samrat</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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Importance:</b> The authors demonstrated the effective use of integrated nutrient management system (INM) to enhance soil health and crop productivity in Green gram.</p> <p>2. <b>Title:</b> Needs enhancement and preferred to be modified into “<b>Integrated Nutrient Management in Green gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) for Enhancing Soil Health</b>”.</p> <p>3. <b>Abstract:</b> Clear to a greater extent. The abbreviations have to be clarified on their first appearance. The measuring units have to adjusted in the writing style. Add the P-value for the significant results as suggested. Many modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>4. <b>Structure of the manuscript:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Keywords:</b> Clear and properly arranged.</li> <li><b>Introduction:</b> Clear to a certain extent and properly displayed. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li><b>The aim:</b> Not listed.</li> <li><b>Materials and methods:</b> Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No institutional ethical approval number was provided.</li> <li>The authors did not provide the statistical analysis section with a reference and the statistical model used.</li> <li>Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>Results:</b> Novel and clear to some extent. Reduce the using of results numerical value in the text to a minimum level. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Discussion:</b> Not listed.</li> <li><b>Conclusion:</b> Clear and informative. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li><b>Tables:</b> Well-presented and organized. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability.</li> <li><b>Figures:</b> Not listed as refered to in the results section.</li> </ol> <p>5. <b>Scientific Soundness:</b> The manuscript highlighted a novel idea in moderate language and grammar that requires professional proofreading and copyediting. The absence of the discussion section with the argument between the current results and the previous researches can minimized the importance of the manuscript.</p> <p>6. <b>References:</b> MUST BE UPDATED as 8.3% (1 out of 12) 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><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>General view:</b> The manuscript was written in moderate English and grammar. No discussion was listed to compare the current results with the previous researches. Copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value and enhance the importance of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Essam Samir Soliman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Suez Canal University, Egypt</b>