

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_98617</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Different Sources of Phosphorus on protein content, soil fertility and Yield of Greengram</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. 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The article is an original research work on the <i>Effect of Different Sources of Phosphorus on protein content, soil fertility and Yield of Greengram</i>. It contributes to an important aspect of agricultural sciences. Overall, it is a good article and may be accepted after the suggested changes have been implemented.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive but old data has been used (around 9 years old). More recent data of this study should have been included.</p> <p>4. The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct but outdated.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient and old. More recent references should be included in the text.</p> <p><b>Additional comments:</b></p> <p>i. The keywords are traditionally written in alphabetical order separated by semicolons.</p> <p>ii. The longitudes and latitudes of the study area should be mentioned in the Materials and Method section.</p> <p>iii. The experiment reported in this research is close to a decade old (9Year 2014). Some improvements in agricultural practices and policies must have taken place since then. The authors should do some research and include recent data.</p> <p>iv. For inserting formula in the Materials and Method section, the author(s) should use "equations" option.</p> <p>v. The author(s) may insert some graphs for table 1, 2 and 3 for better visual understanding of the trends.</p> <p>vi. The author(s) should include some photographs of the actual experimental site, crops, soil samples, etc. along with data on the prevailing weather conditions like temperature, precipitation, humidity, etc. for better gauging of the research.</p> <p>vii. The author(s) should add a "future scope of study" section after the conclusion section, describing in brief how this current research can help in future agricultural research and related policies.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</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>Avdesh Bhardawaj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>