

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_116743
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Fertility Status of Soils under Different Cropping Patterns in rainfed Semi-Arid Eastern Plain of Rajasthan
Type of the Article	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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, This study evaluated soil characteristics under various cropping systems (Pearl millet, Sorghum, Ground nut, Mung-bean, Maize, Pasture) across three sites in Tonk District. Results indicated pH ranging from slightly acidic to slightly alkaline, with varying levels of organic carbon and Nitrogen. Soil physical condition ranked highest in Mung-bean, followed by groundnut, Maize, Sorghum, Pearl-millet, and Pasture.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Modifications required as the sentence formation was poor and narration on overall view was lacking</p> <p>4. Ok</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Recent reviews should be added in discussion</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality and sentence need to be corrected and upgraded</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract: Modifications required as the sentence formation was poor and narration on overall view was lacking • Introduction: Style of quoting the co authors • Materials and methods: Data on weather parameters prevailed during experimentation? • Results and discussion: Modifications were required with respect to grammatical mistakes and sentence formation, Proper supporting studies with respect to discussion were not mentioned, Reasons for certain parameters like pods increases porosity etc., were irrelevant if so, mentioned the supporting data with reference and Re frame the sentences for proper meaningful sentence • Figures: Legends was mentioned, titles of x axis and y axis was not mentioned • Conclusion: Not properly concluded the topic and modifications required in sentence formation and precise writing • References: Check the format of writing references as the uniformity in quoting references 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakhesh S
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences Dharwad, India