

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_106368</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nutrient Efficient and Productive Cropping Systems for Northern Telangana Zone, of Telangana</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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>This manuscript is written with a good title and good English. The substance is important for the scientific community. The introduction is good even too lengthy. There are several things I concerned of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The research objective is not clearly declared in Abstract or Introduction or in Methodology. Please declare clearly the objective in Abstract and Introduction.</li> <li>2. Please list the 12 treatments in a single table in Methodology to increase their readability! It is a bit difficult to compare and contrast with the current presentation.</li> <li>3. Results tables (Except Table 3) were not referred in the Results &amp; Discussion. Please refer the related result table when discussing any variable.</li> <li>4. The conclusions written in the Conclusions do not match those written in Abstract. Please check carefully!</li> <li>5. References are OK.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Good	
<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>Abdul Kadir Salam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Lampung, Indonesia</b>