

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96934
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nutrient Management and Crop Residue Incorporation on Phosphorus Uptake of Maize (Zea mays L) at different growth stages
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Abstracts are generally between 200-300 words. The abstract must be able to provide an overview regarding the formulation of the problem, methods and conclusions In the introductory section, there are many statements and data without literary sources In the discussion section, don't just describe the table, but provide analysis and then strengthen it by comparing it with the results of other researchers' research The conclusion section generally does not display literature sources and only conveys the results of the discussion in accordance with the problem formulation The references used are minimal, there should be at least 25 literature. Writing references also has not used the Medeley or Zatero applications The references used are generally very old, it should be at least the last 10 years	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	check the writing consistency again	
Optional/General comments	check back writing abstract and discussion. Make sure the problem formulation and method points appear in the abstract. The discussion should not only describe the table	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	I Nengah Muliarta
Department, University & Country	Warmadewa University, Indonesia