

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_119076
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Nanofertilizers on Soil Microbial Populations
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The study is significant for the community in a way that it has highlighted the major issue agriculture is facing in terms of fulfilling food requirement of the growing population. Secondly, this study has provided an innovative solution to increase the crop production.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable and appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract has provided a good summary of the entire article. But it's better to add the results related to plant's height, nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium uptake in one or two sentence in the abstract.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is very well written and well structured. Sufficient information is provided regarding the methodology used for conducting the research. Findings are very well presented in the form of tables and figures. All the substructure of the articles are well structured and sufficient and appropriate information is provided in each section.</p> <p>5. Yes, manuscript appears scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient but only few references are recent. Recent references can be added if available.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language of the manuscript is simple and easy to understand, hence communicable to the readers or audience.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Amara Aftab
Department, University & Country	Govt Girls Postgraduate College Quetta Cantt., Pakistan