

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123150
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochar-based slow-release nitrogen fertilizer performance on growth and development of wheat in Indo-Gangetic Plains
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The main contribution of this manuscript is the exploration of alternative fertilization sources that are more efficient and less harmful to the environment. However, there are a few areas that could benefit from further detail. Firstly, while the authors mention the benefits of these fertilizers, it would be helpful to know if the results are indeed promising. Additionally, it would be beneficial to understand the rationale behind the selection of treatments and the reason for not comparing them with traditional fertilization methods. Lastly, a more detailed description of the statistical methods used to compare the treatments would help ensure the conclusions are accurate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The summary needs to improve the description of the experimental conditions and more clearly describe the treatments.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In the introduction section, the authors should emphasize, through a review of the literature, the effectiveness of these fertilizers for both plant growth and environmental sustainability. Additionally, they should compare the use of NCU (Nitrogen-Coated Urea) and BCU (Bio-Coated Urea), identify the most commonly used nitrogen sources in India, and outline the hypotheses of their study. In the methods section, it is essential to detail all experimental conditions, with a particular focus on the chemical properties of the soil and the application of treatments. Furthermore, the statistical methods used to compare treatments should be clearly described. In the results section, the authors should present the chemical analysis results of nitrogen in the plants to support the discussion and minimize speculation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Many sentences in the introductory section are without citation, and in the methods section as well.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Filipe Vieira Araújo
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Dos Vales Dos Jequitinhonha E Mucuri, Brazil