

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_107762</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Studies on depth wise distribution of available nutrients of soil under different land use planning of Kanpur Nagar (U.P.)</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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, the author of this article carried out 504 samples to study the fertility of the soil studied site, this number is representative it led to significantly accepted results, these results can be a database for the scientific community in the field of agriculture, and also to optimize the dose of fertilizers to add to this soil, this scientific research saves time and the quantity and type of fertilizer to use. The experimental research carried out by the author enters into the sustainable development of agriculture, through knowledge of the state of fertility of the soil studied, and consequently playing on the optimal dose of fertilizer that must be added for good crop production and long-term sustainable growth.</p> <p>2. Yes the title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract is clear and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes it is.</p> <p>5. Yes I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are largely sufficient and recent.</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>1. The English language quality is appropriate 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><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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Nedjah Nawel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Higher School of Technology and Engineering, Algeria</b>