

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_108490</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nutrient uptake and post harvest nutrient status of elephant foot yam influenced by integrated nutrient management under coastal condition</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is but should be written properly.</p> <p>No. The title is confused. (Effect of the combined nutrient fertilization on elephant foot yam under coastal condition)</p> <p>The abstract does not explain the methodology of the research. The objective is missing.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Not at all</p> <p>Not even recommended for a secondary school research. The citation order is not respected.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>It should be written properly before it can be suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The study carried out by the author(s) could be interesting and meaningful if well elaborated and presented. This manuscript is well structured (Title, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusions and References). However, some serious major revisions are required before being accepted for publication.</p> <p>The title is not very clear and does not match the main objective who is missing.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract is not well explained, there is no explanation of what and how the experiments where conducted. Results are exhibited and there no brief explanation of what was done. The objective of the research is missing.</p> <p>The key words section content abbreviated words which should not be considered.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction should be increased about the problematic of the crop in study. The introduction is a repetition of the abstract with few more words (163 for the abstract and 273 for the introduction). Some sentence or ideas are incomplete; this section is extremely poor. The cited references in this section do not match the order of appearance of the references. When the citation is numbered, it should follow an order of citation and not as (3,7,1 and 4) as it is presented in the section. The only one (1) paragraph make the introduction extremely poor, and the objective does not exist. Need to be rewritten.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: This section is extremely confusing and very poor seen the magnitude of the study, it is barely not existing. The materials and methods used in this section are not defined at all, there is one experiment (which impossible to produce a scientific article), there is no title and not clearly explained. The evaluated parameters are</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>not well defined. Kindly rewrite this entire section properly, declare all experiments titles, explain each experiment and define which experiment design was used.</p> <p>No description of the data analysis section. It suggested a clearly write up.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: This section can be written better if the Materials and Methods section is better written. The results are very confused, lack of statistical organization. There is no accurate explanation of the results and the discussion is not visible. There is barely one page of the results and discussion with 3 tables, which representation does not match the write up of the same. The author(s) need to represent and properly discuss their results. Kindly rewrite this entire section properly.</p> <p>Conclusions: This section depends on the transparency of the results and discussion in order to have better conclusions.</p> <p>A total of 10 references which is not even recommended for a secondary school research.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Edwin Ronnie Gakegne
Department, University & Country	Instituto Superior Politécnico Sol Nascente, Angola