

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111655
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF DIFFERENT NUTRIENT SOURCE ON YIELD AND SOIL PROPERTIES OF BLACK GRAM (Vigna mungo L. HEPPEL) UNDER ORGANIC FARMING
Type of the Article	

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> <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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, The Manuscript can contribute an input for the scientific community As the nutrient are an important factor that determines yield assessing as such is a good input for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? No. It requires modifications as Introduction, Methods, Result and Conclusion</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? No. Require to be updated.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes. But it requires more to be amended.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No. Require to be updated since most are old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. Require to be rewritten</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Abstract</p> <p>I think it is better if rewritten again as follows: Introduction: you have to write the gap that attracts the reader attention which drives you to conduct this study -again aim of the study to fill the stated gap. Methods: Briefly you have to state how the study was conducted. Even if it is impossible to mention all the procedure, you have to state the major methods of this study. Result: the finding that you obtained from the followed procedure or methods. Conclusion: your generalization based on the findings.</p> <p>Introduction Introduce from what is known to the unknown one.</p> <p>Material and methods Incorporate: Chemical and reagents used, Equipment used, specifically narrate the procedure you followed rather than providing or citing only the previous conducted study, and provide the updated references as all used method are too old.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Result Try to use the different software for data analysis to present your findings.</p> <p>Discussion No discussion at all. Discussion is the most important and difficult part of scientific writing.</p> <p>Conclusion It looks result. But you have to generalize based on your study findings.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ebsa Tofik Ahmed
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, Haramaya University, Ethiopia

Review Form 1.7