

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_118379
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of integrated nitrogen management practices on nutrient content and their uptake by transplanted rice crop (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript explains how integrated nitrogen promotes nutrient uptake.</p> <p>2. Alternative title is: Integrate nitrogen management practices promote nutrient uptake in rice crop (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L)</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct because the authors introduced different fractions of nitrogen and means of uptake.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient. I included some places where references are needed, and I observed that the authors add just one reference anywhere they referenced. I will be surprised if just one publication has been made in any of their cited comments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the English quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>2. The reviewer suggest that the authors include significant figures wherever they claim significant difference(s).</p> <p>3. Too many short statements were observed, and I have suggested that the authors make use of conjunctions to get succinct and meaningful sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors should endeavor to incorporate the highlighted corrections and ask questions regarding any reviewer comment they do not agree with.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chukwudi Humphrey Omeoga
Department, University & Country	University at Albany, State University of New York, United States of America