

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>   |
| 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>This article assesses the effect of integrated nitrogen management practices on nutrient content and uptake by transplanted rice. The title of the article is appropriate. In the abstract section, the issues are missing. the abstract section is incomplete. Overall, the article is well written, but the material, method and discussion section should be improved by explaining the results obtained. No, the references are very old. Some suggested literature is:<br/> <a href="https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.881116">https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2022.881116</a><br/> <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fpbi.13312">https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fpbi.13312</a><br/> <a href="https://doi.org/10.1094/PHI-I-2018-0403-01">https://doi.org/10.1094/PHI-I-2018-0403-01</a></p> <p>see the attachment</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>  | Minor revision  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   |   |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Nikiema Dominique</b>                        |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso</b> |