

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99728</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IMPACT OF FERTIGATION REGIMES ON QUALITY OF GINGER (Rio-De-Jenereo and Himachal)</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> )

### 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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. 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><b>IMPACT OF FERTIGATION REGIMES ON QUALITY OF GINGER (Rio-De-Jenereo and Himachal)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community in the sense that it tackles a topic that is related to food production in the form of ginger</li> <li>2. The title is suitable.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article was comprehensive.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. Yes, it is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The references are not sufficient enough</li> </ol> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For the introduction, it can be improved by adding more related literature about the possible impacts and/or uses of fertigation not only in ginger but in other root crops or vegetable as well. Also, the introduction lacks citation which means less literature were included. Thus, more updated and recent literature should be added to make the introduction more comprehensive. Also, state at the last stanza the objectives (specific) of the study</li> <li>2. In the materials and methods, it seems some important parts of the typical materials and methods is missing such as the collection of sample, statistical treatment used, step-by-step procedure in conducting the said experiment and the source or where the methodology were derived. It can be improved by inserting the said pars and by stating the detailed process in conducting the study.</li> <li>3. The result is well-written, however, it can be improved by organizing the data in logical or in correct order. The result or tables where the data is should be included in the result and discussion, not after the conclusion. Also, further discussion with supporting and/or contrasting statement should be provided to establish the claim for the result.</li> <li>4. In the conclusion, the answer in the question about the impacts of fertigation was not directly answered. Answer it to make it clear.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Jomell M. Santiago</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines</b>