

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110921
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of FYM, Vermi- compost, Azotobacter inoculation and Chemical fertilizers on Growth and Yield in Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.)
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typo: "frowth" should be corrected to "growth." "@ should be corrected to at" check this throughout the script. • The abstract lacks a clear, concise summary of the methodology and major findings. It's recommended to include a brief overview of the experimental design, key results, and conclusions. 2. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introductory section provides a good overview but lacks clear objectives. It's important to explicitly state the objectives or hypotheses of the study. • The introduction could be improved by adding a more structured flow, starting with the importance of wheat as a staple crop, moving on to the need for increased production, and then introducing the specific focus of the study. 3. Material and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The description of the experimental setup and methodology lacks clarity. Consider breaking it down into subsections for better readability, such as soil preparation, treatments, application methods, and crop management. • Specify the rationale behind selecting the mentioned doses of Vermicompost, FYM, and other components for better understanding and reproducibility of the experiment. • More specific details about measurements and data collection methods would enhance the methodological clarity. 4. Results and Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results section lacks interpretation and discussion of the findings presented in the tables. Each result should be discussed in relation to the hypothesis or objective of the study. • Ensure consistency in the presentation of data; for instance, in Table 2, there's an empty cell under treatment T3. • Consider citing additional literature to support the observed results and to compare them with previous studies in the field. • Use appropriate statistical analysis terminology to discuss the significance of the results. 5. Conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion summarizes the findings but should reiterate the key results and their implications clearly. • It would be beneficial to link the conclusions back to the study's objectives and suggest future directions for research based on the outcomes. 6. General: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article lacks citations for specific claims and statements made throughout the text. Ensure that all assertions are supported by relevant references. • Proofread the entire article for grammatical errors, typos, and inconsistencies in formatting and terminology. • Maintain consistency in abbreviations (e.g., RDF) and terminology throughout the article. <p>In academic articles, precision, clarity, and coherence are crucial. Ensure that the article adheres to the standard structure and format required by the target journal or publication platform. Additionally, proper citations and references should support the statements made in the text.</p> 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Raphael Babaniyi
Department, University & Country	Nigeria