

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_108625
Title of the Manuscript:	Latex sludge waste biocompost for management of soil fertility and productivity
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Compulsory 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>The research is highly applicable, and the technology is easy to adapt. This research has a title that matches the content of the manuscript. the methods used are also appropriate and comprehensive. However, there are some suggestions that can be conveyed to make the script better, including:</p> <p>Abstract Should be written directly in paragraph form, there is no need for parts (Objectives, Design, Methods, etc.)</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Narration is too wide 2. latex characteristics are not exposed 3. no state of the art 4. there is no problem statement, and objectives to solve the problem statement <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. no need to repeat what has been written in the introduction 2. make it more systematic and clearer related to fixed, changing and observable variables 3. what statistical methods are used <p>Results and discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. only focus on the results achieved 2. no comparison with previous research 3. the discussion is narrow and not in-depth 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Need to be proofed read	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) NO	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gregorius Prima Indra Budianto
Department, University & Country	University of Setia Budi, Indonesia