

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJECC_105125  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of soil fertility status of research farm, College of Agriculture and Research Station, Katghora, Korba, Chhattisgarh |
| 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://journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>

### **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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>I consider that it is convenient to point out the intention and the effort that the authors make in wanting to make the manuscript and bring an experience to a research product, that is certainly valuable and recognized. I think it would be an interesting model to improve and clearly establish originality.</p> <p>Your work is interested, written well, and organized. However, there are some comments should be considered before publishing, in this way, the scientific quality of the manuscript would be improved.</p> <p>I suggest the authors update the bibliography, many of the citations are more than 15 years old, therefore I suggest adding recent references which address the issue in question. Suggested citations are for genuine scientific reasons that emphasize the current topic of study in context.</p> <p>Authors should consider the corrections suggested by the reviewers. In this way the postulated manuscript would be reasonably presented, fluent reading.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   |  |   |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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:                            | <b>Barlin Orlando Olivares</b>      |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Cordoba, Spain</b> |