

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_113713
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Vermi-compost and Hydrogel (Pusa) on Soil Dynamics, Nutrient uptake & Water Productivity through Wheat Crop
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>1. I believe that the manuscript bears importance in advancing technologies in a scientific community and does hold merit significance wise.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>3. The abstract delivered a comprehensive overview of the article.</p> <p>4. Subsections are appropriate, however the article as a whole is too long for an ideal research publication. I suggest to further compress important data results and highlight salient points of the results attained during the study. Be concise and direct to the point in your discussion section.</p> <p>5. The article, specifically the tabular parts are very convoluted and seems so all over the place. Further, the tables could be edited/compressed to reduce gaps in between data sets. Until this issue will be addressed then I think I could decide on its correctness scientifically speaking. In short, I suggest the authors to revise their tables and properly arrange data sets.</p> <p>6. Several cited sources were not found in the reference section. Please review the article as a whole and reflect all cited sources in the reference. This also applies the other way around making sure that referenced sources were actually cited inside the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This is highly recommended to cohesively weave the discussions and explanations in the article. Maybe an English communication expert could help the authors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bryan Glomel S. Silverio
Department, University & Country	University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Philippines