

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 | |

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>The data presented is important to a layman but not to the scientific community. In science we look at statistics. This paper has no statistical analysis and we cannot verify the significance of the results presented. This renders them just mere numbers in tables and figures with no scientific meaning.</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>NO. The abstract is indeed not comprehensive. It does not give an executive summary of the paper. No comprehensive introduction on the knowledge gap being addressed has been given. The important results have also not been presented. . An abstract should summarize the paper in totality from introduction to conclusion. The introduction is too short and vague. What was the knowledge gap that led to this investigation/research? How were the samples collected? How were they analysed? Which methods were used to analyse the data scientifically? What are the key points or results that were significant? What does the study conclude? These should be presented for the reader to quickly judge and grasp the relevance of the paper</p> <p>The subsections need proper structured. The author is just bundling paragraphs after paragraphs together. Each element should have a subsection before the data and results pertaining to it are presented and discussed. The author has not made a number of referenced to tables and figures within text and they have been placed randomly as to confuse the readers. Section 3 should be for results and discussion. The results have not been discussed and we do not have an interpretation for the results. There is also no statistical analysis of the results shown except the correlations which have also not been discussed and inferred. The manuscript is therefore rendered scientifically incorrect.</p> <p>The reference list/ list of bibliography should have all authors cited within the text and manuscript. The authors have included works that have not been cited within text. The article is under researched. The references do not qualify the journal for publication as is. The author MUST read further.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>No. The language and grammar is poor, confusing and does not present the data scientifically as to meet standards of publication in any serious journal.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

[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: | Vincent Rabach |
| Department, University & Country | Kenyatta University, Kenya |