

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104857
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT LEVELS OF FERTILIZERS IN COMBINATION WITH BIOFERTILIZERS ON NUTRIENT CONTENT AND UPTAKE OF KHARIF MAIZE
Type of the Article	

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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>General Comments</p> <p>From my point of view, it is a very interesting topic and simultaneously it seems that to the best of my knowledge is an important research based on an experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with seven treatments and replicated thrice. The treatments consisted of T₁- Control; T₂- 100% RDF; T₃- 125% RDF; T₄ – 100% RDF + VAM; T₅- 100% RDF +VAM + <i>Azospirillum</i> + PSB; T₆- 75 % RDF + VAM; T₇- 75 % RDF + VAM + <i>Azospirillum</i> + PSB. During <i>kharif</i> in two years of study significantly higher nitrogen content and uptake was recorded with 125 % RDF (T₃) it was on par with 100% RDF + VAM + <i>Azospirillum</i> + PSB (T₅) and 100% RDF + VAM (T₄). The aim of this study was to see the effect of different levels of fertilizers along with biofertilizers on nutrient content and uptake by maize crop. Higher phosphorus, potassium and sulphur (non-significant) content and uptake were recorded in the treatment T₅ that received 100% RDF +VAM + <i>Azospirillum</i> + PSB and it was on par with treatment which received 75 % RDF + VAM + <i>Azospirillum</i> + PSB (T₇), 125 % RDF (T₃) and 100% RDF + VAM (T₄) at knee high, tasseling and harvest stage of maize. The results revealed that application of biofertilizers along with inorganic fertilizers significant increased plant nutrient content and uptake of maize crop. The paper consists of the sections: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion.</p> <p>However, I find some recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract must contains the main purpose of the paper, the research method used in the research and the main contributions. It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research. The Literature Review section cannot be missing from the paper. I consider an econometric model will increase the quality of the paper. In the same time, I consider the literature review section cannot missing from the paper and that is why we consider that the literature is not enough and that is why, we recommend the authors to refer to other recent works indexed in Web of Science, Scopus, Emerald, Cambridge, and of course MDPI Journals. We suggest that the authors cite papers published in MDPI journals and Web of Science Journals, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Batrancea L., Batrancea I., Moscviciov A. (2009), The Roots of the World Financial Crisis, <i>Annals of Faculty of Economics</i>, 3(1):57-62. Moscviciov, A., Bătrâncea, I., Bătrâncea, M., Bătrâncea, L.M. (2010) Financial Ratio Analysis Used In the It Enterprises, <i>Annals of the University of Oradea: Economic Science</i>, 19(2):600-603. We also consider that an important cause that influences GDP is fiscal compliance and therefore even if this variable was not taken into account, the authors should refer to the works published on this topic, namely: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Batrancea L.M., Nichita R.A., Batrancea I. (2012), Tax Non-Compliance Behavior in the Light of Tax Law Complexity and the Relationship between Authorities and Taxpayers, <i>Annals of the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University-Economics</i>, 59(1), pp.97–106. <p>We recommend the authors to number the paragraphs: 1. Introduction; 2.Literature review; 3. Methods and Results, Discussions and Conclusions.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	In conclusion, the article should be thoroughly rebuilt (changes in structure recommended above). It should also be enhanced with a review of the literature adequate to the subject and a broader interpretation and commentary of the research results.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The Manuscript needs careful English proofreading because there are some shortcomings. For instance, the article "the" is sometimes missing in front of nouns, the message in some paragraphs is not clear enough.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Batrancea Larissa Margareta
Department, University & Country	Babes-Bolyai University, Romania