

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_113766</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Organic Nitrogen Effects on Root Architecture in Rice Seedlings</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Root architecture is said to affect the plant health and growth. This study seeks to validate the effects of nitrogen on root architecture and come up with the best dosage of nitrogen to the rice under investigation.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Suitable</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract need improvements, clearly stating the research gap and the intended solution. There is need to include the background of the research as far as nitrogen is concerned on root architecture.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Scientifically correct</b></p> <p>6. <b>Sufficient, though there is need to include recent work within 5 years of research work. Referring to work done in 1995 is not sounding good.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Good	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The conclusion should link up with the objectives of the study.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shumba Tobias Takawira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Harare Polytechnic, Zimbabwe</b>