

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100107</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECT OF DIFFERENT LEVELS OF FERTILIZERS IN COMBINATION WITH BIOFERTILIZERS ON AVAILABLE NUTRIENT STATUS OF SOIL IN KHARIF MAIZE</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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. <b>Importance:</b> The study measured the available macronutrients such as (nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium) of maize during the study period of Kharif of 2020-21 under the influence of fertilizer and bio-fertilizers at different levels and combinations.</p> <p>2. <b>Title:</b> Too long and preferred to be modified into "<b>Fertilizers and Biofertilizers application Impact on Available Macronutrients in Soil of Kharif maize</b>".</p> <p>3. <b>Abstract:</b> Provide an opening statement of one or two sentences before illustrating the aim. Display the full names of the used abbreviations at their first appearance. The P-value was not displayed with significant results. Some modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>4. <b>Structure of the manuscript:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Keywords:</b> Flow the suggested modifications for more understanding and attractively text.</li> <li>b. <b>Introduction:</b> Improperly displayed in two paragraphs. Re-arrange into three paragraphs only i.e., 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li>c. <b>The aim:</b> Not listed.</li> <li>d. <b>Materials and methods:</b> Please notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No institutional ethical approval number was provided.</li> <li>2. Provide the model of the spectrophotometer used for measurement in the study.</li> <li>3. Some abbreviations were used and have to be clarified as full names on their first appearance.</li> <li>4. The authors did not provide the statistical analysis section with a reference and the statistical model used.</li> <li>5. Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. <b>Results:</b> Novel and clear to some extent. Add the P-value for the significant results in the text. The authors have to avoid the redundancy that was attributed to 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.</li> <li>f. <b>Discussion:</b> Clear and informative with moderate comparison and speculation. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li>g. <b>Conclusion:</b> Concise, clear, and informative. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li>h. <b>Tables:</b> Well-presented and organized.</li> </ul> <p>5. <b>Scientific Soundness:</b> The manuscript discussed a good non novel idea with moderate language and grammar that requires professional proofreading and copyediting.</p> <p>6. <b>References:</b> MUST BE UPDATED as zero% (0 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. A certain degree of 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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

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